

TERMS—\$2.50 a year, in advance.

75 cents per copy

THE  
**LUTHERAN QUARTERLY**

CONDUCTED BY

J. A. SINGMASTER, D. D.

FREDERICK G. GOTWALD, D. D.

JACOB A. CLUTZ, D. D.

---

VOL. XLV—NO. 3.

---

**JULY, 1915.**

Entered at the Gettysburg Post-office as second-class matter.  
GETTYSBURG, PA.

COMPILER PRINT  
1915

# CONTENTS

<b>I. The New Obedience.....</b>	<b>309</b>
(The Sixth Article of the Augsburg Confession)	
By Professor John A. Himes, Litt.D.	
<b>II. The Place of Art in Worship.....</b>	<b>337</b>
By Professor Herbert C. Alleman, D.D.	
<b>III. Pulpit Prayer .....</b>	<b>344</b>
By Professor Jacob A. Clutz, D.D.	
<b>IV. American Defects of Sentiment .....</b>	<b>367</b>
By T. B. Stork, Esq.	
<b>V. Christ's Authority Throughout the New Testament....</b>	<b>379</b>
By Professor Leander S. Keyser, D.D.	
<b>VI. Lutheran Education .....</b>	<b>394</b>
By Professor L. H. Larimer, D.D.	
<b>VII. Revelation and Dogmatics .....</b>	<b>409</b>
By Rev. J. S. Simon, D.D.	
<b>VIII. War Letters of a Pastor to His Colleague.....</b>	<b>426</b>
Translation by Rev. W. A. Lambert.	
<b>IX. Current Theological Thought .....</b>	<b>435</b>
I. In English. By Professor J. A. Singmaster, D.D.	
II. In German. By Professor Abdel Ross Wentz, Ph.D.	
<b>X. Review of Recent Literature. ....</b>	<b>455</b>
A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research—The Quest for Wonder, and other Philosophical and Theological Studies—The Heart of Blackstone—The Rise of Modern Religious Ideas—Selected Sermons and Addresses—A Boy's Religion.	

# THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY.

JULY, 1915.

---

## ARTICLE I.

### THE NEW OBEDIENCE.

BY PROFESSOR JOHN A. HIMES, LITT.D.

(THE SIXTH ARTICLE OF THE AUGSBURG CONFESSION.)<sup>1</sup>

"Also they teach, that this Faith is bound to bring forth Good Fruits, and that it is necessary to do good works commanded by God, because of God's will, but not that we should rely on those good works to merit justification before God. For remission of sins and justification are apprehended by faith, as also the voice of Christ attests: 'Where ye shall have done all these things, say, We are unprofitable servants' (Luke 17:10). This same is also taught by the Fathers. For Ambrose says: 'It is ordained of God that he who believes in Christ is saved; freely receiving remission of sins, without works, by faith alone.'"

The task here assigned to me is an unusual one to be committed to a layman. The single preceding instance differs from the present in two respects: first, the lecturer came from a family of distinguished theologians; and secondly, his life-work as a jurist fitted him particularly for the discussion of the special topic that fell to his lot.

<sup>1</sup> Lecture on the Holman Foundation, delivered in the Theological Seminary, Gettysburg, Pa., May 4, 1915.

I have had no inheritance and no training in formal theology. I shall make no pretense of quoting from the authorities; I do not even know who they are. My vocabulary may fail in technical precision, and my attempt to translate life directly into verbal expression is likely to lack the exactness with which you are familiar in the polished and passionless formulae of theological science. I was persuaded to accept this appointment by the consideration urged upon me that it might be profitable, even though less scholarly, to have the subject considered from the stand-point of every day experience. For the thorough and authoritative treatment of the Article I refer you to my learned and illustrious predecessors, the much-loved Charles A. Stork and Charles S. Albert.

#### THE SPHERE OF FAITH.

The term "faith," like some other much used words, is often handled as a mere counter scarcely suggestive of what it stands for. In this discussion it will be more important to keep before us the main content of the term than an unimpeachable definition. I shall use the word to signify what men believe about the Maker of the great world we live in, which we contemplate with so much interest, which we study scientifically in its constitution, forces, laws and changes, which we wonder at in its extent, variety, sublimity and beauty, and which puzzles us with its innumerable forms of life and intelligence. Faith also includes our belief in an authenticated and extraordinary Messenger from the Maker of this world to his intelligent creatures in it, disclosing his plans and purposes for them and his expectations from them. If such a Messenger ever came to men, that coming was a long way the most stupendous event the world ever witnessed. In substituting certainty for doubt as to whether the sovereign Mind that controls the universe has any care for us who so much need his care, who feel so sorely our orphaned condition, who so search for Him to satisfy our thoughts and longings it made a revolution in the whole empire of mind and heart. Faith includes, finally, our



belief in the communion of the Creator with his creatures through an ever-present, though invisible, Agent who operates in our spiritual nature and instructs us for the constant enlargement of our higher life. There is no need to insist upon how much such a faith contributes to human exaltation.

#### VARIETIES OF FAITH.

Regarded as individuals, however, men are differently affected by the objects of faith, that is, by the things believed. Some give a mere otiose assent to an inherited or fashionable creed and concern themselves no more about it. Their thoughts are absorbed by a thousand and one things that come in a day's experience, and fail to distinguish between the great and the small. To use a current phrase, they have no sense of values. They repeat the orthodox creed ever so often; they can repeat it without thinking about it, and unquestionably they do often so repeat it. Let us call this the *indifferent* faith.

Another kind may be called *hostile* faith. It has more vitality than the preceding. The possessor of this faith—or shall we say it possesses him?—recognizes what he believes as opposed to his plans and interests. The Creator has purposes antagonistic to his own and irreconcilable therewith; the heavenly Ambassador announces a programme destructive of his own; the operation of the divine Energy in the world is an obstacle to the success of his designs. In consequence he violently resists and combats the Power in which he believes. This kind of faith we know exists in the great Adversary, the devil and his hosts, and it exists in some men.

A third kind may be distinguished as *normal* faith. The belief in a Creator and his attributes commends itself to the reason and in turn produces such results as right reason dictates. If the Creator communicates with us through accredited couriers or an Ambassador extraordinary, we receive them as we receive messengers from other sovereigns with homage and respect. Likewise if the Creator has a constant Agency in the world, it is reason-

able to search for it, to accept it, to harmonize ourselves with it; for, beyond question, whatever is advised or enjoined by the supreme Wisdom, of which creation gives evidence, must in itself be in the highest degree wholesome and beneficent. He who is ruled by such a conviction can never be charged therein with credulity or superstition, but must be credited with the sanest possible thinking. This is said not with the purpose of taking human reason too seriously, but with the wish of supplying a safe rule where that reason proves itself insufficient.

We hear of a fourth kind of faith which must be designated as the *extraordinary*. Some persons profess so close an intimacy with the Divine that they are able to accomplish marvellous works without the use of the customary means. Doubtless there are degrees of faith or assurance, and possibly even now some that are comparable to those of the apostolic age. Men of great piety and devotion commonly hesitate to claim for themselves any power approaching the miraculous, but some of them would consider it a weakness to doubt that physical results may come as an answer to prayer. Personally I do not find it easy to enter into the confidence of the latter. Certainly there is a great difference between doing the will of God and expecting the reward of his favor, and taking the initiative oneself and calling upon God for his ratification.

In any department of activity a man's belief, if it has any positiveness, is bound to affect his conduct. In daily business his economic ideas will govern his methods and determine his choice; in politics his principles will choose his paper and control his vote; in society his opinions will decide his friendships and antipathies. Hence it seems almost superfluous to demand that a man shall show his faith by his works. The Article under consideration speaks of works as the fruit of faith, as if they grew spontaneously out of the spiritual condition. And so in a great measure they do. Let us consider the fruits of the various species of faith which have been enumerated.

The indifferent faith produces no fruit; it has not vi-

talities enough; it is scarcely better than no faith at all. Decent lives associated with it are only adjustment to environment. Obedience to God and kindness to fellow-men, the natural product of a life ordered by faith, cannot be distinguished as a result of the religious profession. The barren fig-tree showy with leaves is the fit symbol of such a case and the Master's withering curse is its appropriate fate. This is sometimes called the "historic faith," but there is a dignity about the term historic which unfits it for what is in mind, the hollow confession made by fashion or custom—the apathetic or thoughtless rehearsal of the most solemn and weighty truths. Some years ago in a reading of Tennyson's "In Memoriam" the subject of the resurrection of the body was broached, when a bright student remarked that the doctrine was no longer believed. "But it is in the Creed and is repeated every Sunday," he was answered. "Yes, but they don't believe it," he insisted. The incident provoked the question whether the skepticism of the boy was caused by prevalent scientific notions, or by the glib unconcern of the careless worshipper. Variations from this case are furnished by two active pastors of my acquaintance. One of them is accustomed to tell his congregation, when about to repeat the Creed, that they are at liberty to accept as much or as little of it as commends itself to them. The other a few years ago was ready to prepare a dissertation on the Gospel of Mark which was to advance the view that Jesus Christ is not a historic character but a myth.

We must not lightly infer that along with a formal faith is always to be found a merely negative character. Apathy in the supreme matter of our relation to the Divine allows the overgrowth of other affection, ambition, or passion. Not the barren fig-tree but the sown field choked by thorns is the proper symbol of the soul negligent of Divine things. The thorns are the selfish, the hateful, the hurtful, the remorseless feelings that are the usual growth when the nobler sowing is neglected. When God does not positively rule, Mammon or more virulent spirits may assume possession and the indifferent easily

become the hostile faith. The empty house is an invitation to mischievous occupancy.

The hostile faith, as has been remarked, exists in the devils—"The devils also believe, and tremble." The Scriptural statement, doubtless, is made not so much to tell us something about the devils as to characterize the operation of the hostile faith, in spired by devils, in human reprobates. Such have a popular credit for boldness and daring; their deeds defy the laws of men and God; they smite, curse, lie and indulge in all sorts of infamy. Yet when retribution threatens, when schemes fail and guilt is disclosed, the strongest panoplied in wickedness become fearful and abject. "The wicked flee when no man pursueth"; their fear is the product of their apprehension of a Power that makes for righteousness and brings wrong-doers to shame. Herod and official Jerusalem manifested this disturbance when the birth of Christ was announced (Matt. II, 3, et seq.). The fruit of a hostile faith, then, is fear caused by a conviction of failure and impending doom.

The third kind of faith, the reasonable or normal, the kind evidently implied in the sixth Article, must be attended, or followed, by conversion or regeneration, the nature of which it does not fall within our province to discuss. Whatever it is, it puts a man in his right mind, fixes him in his proper attitude to the whole scheme of things. God the Creator is recognized as the rightful Ruler of the universe; he is not only the rightful Ruler, but what he wills and does is unimpeachably fitting, wholesome and just. Not only that, but his grace as manifested in the Redemer corrects, purifies and ennobles all whom it embraces, raising them out of hopeless debasement to inconceivable beauty and excellence of character. The man who believes this welcomes all possible knowledge of God, adapts his life to that knowledge, and is whole-heartedly interested in the Divine scheme and labors for its accomplishment. This is the rational and only comprehensible philosophy of life—that conduct springs out of belief and is evidence of it. The principle lies at the very heart of our discussion and requires a

fuller elucidation.

Before taking it up, however, let us notice the fourth kind of faith, the extraordinary, which proposes to accomplish almost miraculous results by prayer and trust. We hear of men who, disavowing the ordinary means, appeal directly to God for his intervention in the accomplishment of some charitable enterprise, such as the building of a church, or the maintenance of an orphan asylum, or the founding of some other useful institution of religion. This is different from the surprising results accomplished by a magnetic orator or evangelist with an audience; it is an appeal to God to do certain specific things—to God who permits other objects just as worthy to fail if the natural means are not supplied, even though to supply them may be beyond human ability. The story of George Müller, of Bristol, England, who without soliciting from any human being, but solely in reliance upon God, received millions of dollars for his orphan asylum, is a classic example in modern Christianity. The prevailing prayer of Moody the evangelist that God would grant him a particular vacant lot in Chicago for a Bible Training School is perhaps not so well known, but its actuality is authoritatively vouched for. S. D. Gordon, in the *Sunday School Times* of September 14 and 21, 1912, tells a wonderful story of how a Finnish post-mistress in 1908, among an extremely poor people obtained money to build and pay for a chapel. The narrative proceeds with great circumstantiality to tell how at a time of tremendous stress she prayed that the Lord would increase the insufficient sum of gold she had in hand as he had increased the loaves in the wilderness when he fed the multitudes, and the "increase came through prayer alone, without human means being used, though the utmost effort had been made to get human help."

This last story is fitted to raise questions. What is to be thought of these extraordinary cases? Can any possible benefit come from them? Can we imitate these examples and perform like great works? If we can, shall we not have to correct our postulate that natural law governs in the spiritual world? Is there a possibility of

mistake about the stories, or a pious fraud? A suspicious hint of material advantage accruing from such faith looms up to its discredit. A reputation for profound piety of course attaches to those who perform such work; is there to be a revival of the legends of the saints in Protestant Churches? Whatever may be the explanation of these cases, whether they are a product of misconception, or a half-way house to Christian Science, or an actual succession to the works of the Apostles given us to stimulate a stronger faith and a renewed assurance of the activity of God in his world need not here be decided. My temperate skepticism on this point, I find by inquiry, is shared by representative ministers. At best such works are beyond the attainment of Christians in general and are possible, if at all, only to rare spirits.

#### THE RANGE OF OBEDIENCE.

We return to the consideration of that faith and those fruits which are attainable and must be attained by all who deserve the name of Christians. If we believe in a God who takes account of his intelligent creatures, we must, if we are sane, govern our lives by his will, recognizing it as synonymous with all perfection. When he issues instructions we must obey them, and, what is better, we do gladly obey them. "To obey is better than sacrifice." God is not different from men in this respect. Sincere friends are not insensible to each others' interests and desires. Pretended friends strive desperately to cover disloyal deeds with flattering words. Their efforts are worse than futile; the words, though true, are hateful; and the person who utters them is pronounced a hypocrite, more dangerous than a confessed enemy. Andrew Carnegie was a better theologian than Benedict XV when he characterized as mockery and wickedness the proposal of the latter that out of respect to the Saviour the warring nations should suspend arms during the Christmas season with the privilege of afterwards resuming war. God is not slower than men to recognize

hypocrisy and his pure nature is not less sensitive to the smell of strange fire in sacrificial offerings.

Believers are not left without resources to know the mind of God. The Scriptures abound in rules, precepts and admonitions for the government of life. The Decalogue is a plain summary of the fundamental requirements. It reveals God's nature, and, though mainly negative, is a good starting-point for the instruction and training of men in righteousness. A convert from savagery may need to have these commandments impressed upon him and be required to observe them in their most literal sense as an evidence of his Christian faith. After a time he will be prepared for their profounder significance. He is told that they express the will of the Great Spirit in whom he has learned to believe. He may obey them at first from fear of the power of God; he will obey them afterwards because of their wholesome effect as an outcome of Divine wisdom; he will obey them finally because he approves their expression of supreme benevolence and love.

But the Christian's obedience is by no means limited to the Decalogue. Every book of the Bible has its own office of instruction in the way of righteousness. What clusters of precepts are found in Proverbs, in the Psalms, in Job and the Prophets! What impressive lessons from example are taught in the Historical books! Every page is given for the encouragement of our faith, for our safety amid the snares and perplexities that we meet, for the government of our lives, and for the exercise of more positive benevolence towards our fellows. The varied, the refined, the accentuated, the reiterated injunctions are like guide-posts along the path of life directing us solicitously to the blessed goal. There are precepts for the eyes, for the ears, for the tongue, for the hands and the feet. The intellect is taught to distinguish between the great and the small, the noble and the base, the transient and the permanent. There are maxims for training the affections that they may flourish under the genial showers of grace. Faith is the source of all; we accept the guidance because we believe it to come from above.



To confirm it all rises he whom we worship as our Saviour and says to us: "If ye love me, keep my commandments." His words are the most persuasive of all; they appeal to our gratitude; they enjoin upon us loving service like his to mankind; and the more completely we welcome him as a Messenger from the heart of the Creator the more we treasure his commands that we may perfectly obey. The New Testament writers expand and particularize his principles that his disciples may have precept upon precept. Hence the importance of an intimate knowledge of the Scriptures, especially the Gospels, that we may catch his spirit.

This is the final stage, obedience to the Voice within, to the Spirit commissioned to be with us always and to lead us into all truth. We need not be solicitous whether to call this power the Holy Spirit or the enlightened Conscience. Precepts cannot be formulated for every emergency in life, and if they could be, our memories would fail us; but our nature may be so pervaded by pure thoughts and emotions that we instinctively decide aright a new issue thrust upon us. If we err, the uneasiness, the disharmony within, will drive us to repentance. So we rise above the Law and are swayed by Love. Thus though free from the Law and unconscious of its restraints, so led, we shall never violate it.

This, if I understand the Reformers correctly, is what they meant by "the new obedience"—acceptance of the Spirit's leadership. Is it possible for men to be conscious of this high leadership in such a way that they will make no mistake? Yes; as surely as sheep know the voice of their shepherd, or a child knows the voice of its mother. The human voice is modulated by the affections; and the voice of the Spirit is atune with the distinctive qualities of love, joy, peace, patience, gentleness, goodness, faithfulness, meekness and self-control. An attentive ear finds no difficulty in differentiating between the harmonies of Heaven and the envy, malice, wrong and impurity that make discord among the inhabitants of earth.

## A SPECIAL FIELD FOR GOOD WORKS.

A distinction must be recognized between the aforementioned qualities which St. Paul enumerates as the fruits of the Spirit and the things that the Reformers meant by the fruits of faith. The fruits of the Spirit are all states of the soul as distinguished from external actions. Without these states of the soul the good works enjoined would be impossible; even if the acts were scrupulously performed, they would lack the high motive which is essential to their perfection. Where love exists in the soul, the voice is freighted with kind words, the hands are busy with kind deeds; where joy rules, cheerfulness and hope are diffused; where peace reigns, it mollifies the irritations and subdues the jealousy and covetousness of society; and so on through the golden chain of the apostolic beatitudes. The spiritual condition of the Christian manifests itself in constant beneficent activity in recognition of human brotherhood and in imitation of Divine beneficence; this activity is the sum-total of his good works.

In pre-Reformation days good works, as the Confession itself declares, consisted of the performance of unnecessary and puerile acts recommended or required by the Church, such as fasts, pilgrimages, observance of holy days, repetition of pater nosters, worship of saints, monastic vows, &c. Probably even now the idea of something done for, or money contributed to, the benevolent enterprises of the Church is still too exclusively the notion of good works. Regular attendance at church services and liberal contributions to the enterprises of the Church, if honestly administered, are an important part of a Christian's duty, but not the chief part. The good works of the New Testament were by no means limited to the gift of money, and ministrations embraced all humanity instead of being limited to the Church. The largest part by far of the Christian's duty arises out of his daily intercourse with his fellow men and consists of words of sympathy and cheer along with many little acts of kindness, courtesy and helpfulness.

One must not get the impression that these fruits which seem to spring so spontaneously out of the new life need no attention or serious cultivation. Flowers that grow in their native Heaven without visible superintendence or care here need the hand of art. A Christian must make sure that he possesses the virtues implanted and nourished by the Spirit; if he finds any of them feeble or lacking, he must take pains to acquire or strengthen them.

Doubtless the common conception of good works is of isolated beneficent acts, but the words will not be strained if made to include a man's entire vocation that is in the best sense legitimate. Some kinds of business are greatly salutary and avail more for the welfare of mankind than large and systematic alms-giving; other kinds degrade and injure all whom they touch. Since the law of cause and effect extends over the borders of this world into the next, should not the literal furnace fires kindled by hate for casting and welding cannon eventuate in the mystical flames of a torturing Gehenna? On the other hand, should not a calling devoted to benevolent and beautiful works, whether of the mind, the voice, or the hands, attended by a trustful glance upward, lead into an eternity of the "vision beatific"? A Christian will from inclination select a calling that in serving others will give constant exercise to the highest and best within him.

One may well hesitate before classing play and amusements under the head of good works as conceived of by the Reformers. Yet there is a decided tendency to-day in certain quarters to emphasize recreation, exalted by a hyphen to re-creation, as a duty almost, or altogether, equal to that of regular employment. This tendency is manifested in books emanating from the land of the Puritans whence even yet we derive our fashions in thinking. After the variety furnished by the past from the same soil we need not be surprised at the appearance of the new cult of indulgence, antipodal though it is to the heroic old Psalm of Life of an earlier generation. When a Christian seeks relaxation it should be of such a sort and measure as not afterwards to interfere with the main

business of life, or with the keying-up of his powers to their highest capability. The play impulse is over-indulged, and slovenliness especially in intellectual pursuits is the lamentable consequence. The play should be actually restorative; it should leave the passions pure and the reputation unsoiled; it should come within the range of what enlightened believers consider wholesome; it should not make the soul less religious and private communion with God distasteful. Whether the popular amusements in vogue meet these requirements each one must judge for himself. So far and in a somewhat negative way this matter of relaxation may properly come within our scope.

#### LEGALISM.

We are warned against the error of legalism. What is the nature of that error? It is sometimes defined as a scrupulous adherence to the ceremonial law with a view to gaining justification thereby instead of by the atonement of Christ. This would make it an acceptance of the shadow for the substance. Real power comes from the exercise of the spiritual faculty; devotion to ceremonies neglects the spiritual, permits it to become atrophied, and at the same time encourages a security, a lethargy which is exceedingly dangerous. A clear distinction should be drawn between "works" that have a moral value and make a man a better neighbor, a purer citizen, a more zealous defender of righteousness, and those performances that shut the heart to justice and kindness and raise a barrier to the entrance of the divine.

But we must go a step farther. Even if we bind ourselves rigidly to the task of living a correct life according to the more spiritual injunctions of the Scriptures, we shall err if we base our hope of salvation upon our attainments in righteousness and not upon the perfect obedience of Christ. We cannot merit salvation by the excellence of our own works or character. As to that the Article itself quotes the words of Jesus, "When ye shall have done all those things say, We are unprofitable serv-

ants." Legalism, then, does not mean over-diligence in conforming ourselves to the law of God and Christ, but it means reliance upon our virtues for justification. These virtues may manifest the divine life within, but they do not put it there and may even in a measure exist apart from it. They undoubtedly fortify us against certain assaults of evil, but they are not the saving efficacy. To rely upon our virtues would be as vain as to rely upon ceremonial observances which have no merit in themselves.

#### RECIPROCAL RELATION OF FAITH AND WORKS.

Not only does a man's religious faith inspire corresponding acts, but a man's acts, words and thoughts, when directed by Scriptural precepts, have a reflex influence upon his faith clarifying and strengthening it. Good works support faith no less than faith supports good works. Assaults made upon faith, if successful, must weaken the motive to righteousness; carelessness about conduct will becloud and enfeeble faith. He who believes in God, the God of Revelation as well as of Creation, and acts upon his belief has constant evidence that he is in a safe path, and his safety assures him of the validity of his faith. It assures him that God's laws are firm and true; he has tried them by experience,—as sure a test for him as experiment is for the scientist. Not only certainty but enlargement of knowledge comes through Christian experience; that is, through a performance of the "works" enjoined in the Scriptures. Growth is possible in this as in other fields. God favors those who obey him with new visions of his plans and purposes; faith expands into new realms and knowledge follows with new opportunities for experiment.

I pause to notice a doctrine sometimes heard but never to me acceptable; namely, that good morals are often the most serious hindrance to a man's becoming a Christian. "The better he is, the worse he is," is the paradoxical form in which the doctrine has been expressed. If this

means that formalism in religion is particularly hardening, as in the case of the well-seasoned formalists priest and Levite on the Jericho road, the teaching is no doubt correct; if it means that the Samaritan, because of his generous treatment of the wounded victim of robbers, was farther than the churchmen from the kingdom of Heaven, I beg leave to dissent. On the contrary, the teaching of Scripture seems to be, and reason confirms it, that sound views of Divine truth and pure conduct put a man into a most favorable relation to saving faith. Heaven does not accept a man because of his titles or the regularity and fashionableness of his church connections, as a pretentious school may choose and rank its instructors for, and according to, their degrees, but "in every nation he that feareth God and worketh righteousness" is welcomed into the fellowship of the blest. In every other sphere conduct encourages a belief in harmony therewith and religion offers no premium to sham. A man of correct habits is likely to assume correct beliefs, if he does not already possess them.

This reciprocity between faith and works being admitted and harmony between conduct and creed being recognized as the only condition of a genuine life, let us see what may be expected of the individual Christian. Brought into union with an immaculate Jesus he will purify himself in thought, word and act. The sense of propriety is offended at immodest expressions or indecent stories emanating from temples of the Holy Ghost. Pure language, free from grossness and slang, is appropriate to the lips of the friends of God. Bad habits, indeed, are hard to break and cling to a man even after conversion; the delicate sense of what is becoming in a Christian does not exist in everybody; but I expect that even "Billy" Sunday will eventually reduce to propriety his words and acts under the transforming power of the religion he so effectively preaches. Though religion may not polish a man for the artificialities of court and drawing-room it helps greatly to fit him for the society of pure and reasonable men and women.

## SOCIAL EFFECT OF FAITH.

The social effect of this relation of faith to conduct is of supreme importance. If the "new obedience" means anything, it means the observance of our Saviour's *new commandment*, to love one another. This command is not a mere counsel of perfection hopeless of realization, but something that is required equally with reverence for God himself, who is willing that his own gift should wait before the altar until all is made right with the brethren (Matt. IV. 24). This is the balm that the great Physician pours into the wounds of society. It alleviates the calamities and shocks that come in the course of nature; it lessens the evils that attend inequalities of fortune which neither can nor ought to be obliterated; it rebukes all unfairness in dealing, all envies, all selfish ambitions, all hostile plottings, all gloating over the humiliation of our neighbors and co-workers, all spirit of caste, the disposition to keep under inferior and oppressed races, to bend the socially weak to our will, to stir up class hatred, to make our very faith the occasion of division and aversion the bitterest that exists. Strange that soundness in the faith often means the rejection of this late and most precious command of the Master! Alas, for the fate both within and among the churches of this new, gracious law brought down from Heaven to earth!

"Love your enemies; bless your haters, said the Greatest of the great:

Christian love among the Churches looked the twin of heathen hate."

It would be interesting to inquire whether the Reformers thought at all of including international affairs within this Article, whether they held rulers as such bound by the law of good works in their dealings with one another. About seventeen years before the Confession was drawn up Machiavelli published his book *The Prince* in which he taught that the whole duty of a sovereign was to study the art of war. He was the Bernhardi



of his day and had a tremendous influence for evil in Europe; and not impossibly his poison might have infected the thinking of even those clear-headed divines who drew up the Confession. But they treated the matter as outside of their province and contented themselves with declaring it lawful for Christians to "wage just wars and serve in them," and required of civil officers "to perform their duties in the spirit of Christian love." Rulers are treated in the Confession with the finest respect, but they are also warned of a limit to the obedience which they may claim.

One can hardly say, therefore, that international morality is touched upon in the Confession, though obviously the same principles that apply to private persons are applicable also to rulers. Indeed it was a king, the first in Israel, whose presumption upon his divine anointment was checked by the admonition, "To obey is better than sacrifice"; the second king was rebuked with the loss of seventy thousand men, apparently for exulting in his military strength. In the latter as in countless other cases the people suffered for the fault of the king who confessed, "Lo, I have sinned and I have done wickedly; but these sheep, what have they done?" Certainly there is no support in the Bible and I find none in the Confession for the unsound assumption, apart from the sovereign's relation to the laws of his own country, that "The king can do no wrong." No warrant for applying Machiavellian or Mephistophelean instead of Christian ethics to international affairs appears either in Revelation or in writings fairly deduced therefrom.

#### PRESENT STATUS OF THE DOCTRINE.

To us of this generation it belongs not merely to admire this doctrine of the "new obedience" as a piece of ecclesiastical fine-art finished and complete, but to look about us and see what influences, if any, are now at work to mar its perfection or destroy its practical utility. Is its vital interest to Christianity recognized? Is it sufficiently emphasized? Is there any tendency to separate

faith and works which God has joined together?

The matter to be investigated is not whether the individual Christian is obedient to the teaching so that he never violates it in his behavior. It may be admitted that in human weakness he transgresses so that daily repentance is necessary. The inquiry is rather whether the moral and religious atmosphere is such that when he does transgress he feels it and is uncomfortable until he repents and makes reparation. This will depend largely upon the faithfulness of the ministry, upon sentiment fostered by educational agencies and upon ideals of life presented to the young.

The evangelical pulpit in the main, I think, is loyal to the principle that genuine faith will show itself in good works. Certainly the pulpit of Gettysburg cannot be charged with indifference to it. Few sermons have been heard here in recent years that have not declared it and some have done so with a force and eloquence that I would gladly transfer to these pages if I could.

There is, however, a class of clergymen, I know not how large, who are inclined to separate faith and works more than seems to be wise. They are satisfied with proclaiming justification by faith in Jesus Christ much as a priest officiates at a sacrifice, thinking that their whole duty is done when this service is performed. One of these, a former student of the College, though not of this Seminary, expressed his opinion to me not many months ago that it was a mistake to preach morality from the pulpit. To inculcate faith in Jesus Christ and observance of the sacraments and correct forms of worship, he seemed to think, constitutes a minister's whole professional duty. Partial justification for this position may possibly be derived from the extreme tendency in some quarters to abandon the prime function of the Church, to secularize its activities, to make it primarily the ministrant to physical comfort and well-being and to use it for the propagation of certain economic and political theories.

A more pernicious error arises from the effort to build

up a system of ethics separate from faith. This divorce like the former tends to produce laxness in conduct; the former suggests that God is indifferent to the behavior of those who bear his name, if he only secures their formal adherence; the latter that ethics is a sort of convention among men with the content of which God has no concern. Where either idea prevails the sense of accountability is blunted and the moral faculty weakened. It is reported that the newly-elected professor of ethics in the University of Utah is warned to abstain from using the word "religion" in his instruction.

The latter tendency, to put everything on a purely natural basis, is not found much in the pulpit, at least in the Lutheran pulpit, but it pervades the education of the day in many departments. In addition to the attempt to construct ethics without a God, there is a psychology without a soul, a natural science without a Creator, and a religion patched up of various faiths, all supposed to be equally of human origin. The manifest outcome is an education directed ever less to the mind and heart and ever more to the hand. The very word education is giving way to the word training. Religious worship in our Christian institutions has weakened in fervor, diminished in frequency, lost in reverence. We announce brief services, advertise fine music, observe rally days and publish all sorts of attractions. Notwithstanding the strong stimulants constantly applied the spiritual life is becoming feebler. The day of worship is turned into a day of pleasure and secularity unrebuked. The demand for diversion and frivolous enjoyment seems to surpass all precedent and the social and intellectual leaders approve. When attention is called to these things we are answered with figures. Unfortunately the amount of faith in the world does not lend itself readily to statistics. The extraordinary burnt offerings of Saul were not an offset to his disobedience. The experience of David with the prosperity-revealing census of Israel shows that it is the Adversary instead of Jehovah who has use for statistics.

## ANTAGONISTIC FORCES.

Though the foundation of this Article of the Confession is as solid as granite and our ministers are diligent and forceful in proclaiming it, there are influences abroad that would destroy or make it nugatory. Nothing is so axiomatic in these days that it is safe from attack; indeed, the more secure and self-evident a principle is the more it seems to provoke the assaults of the new school of philosophers. Fancy is avowedly preferred to fact; reverie to logic; dreaming to the ordered processes of the intellect. Psychical research among ghosts, hallucinations and mediumistic exploits is marked by a credulity that once would have provoked ridicule. The Futurists in painting have their counterparts in philosophy and both kinds are winning pupils.

The wide-spread humor for assailing whatever is deemed impregnable may eventually reach the "new obedience," indeed has already reached it. Diffuse the false philosophy among our youth who are already headed for confusion by lax and vague methods of instruction, by stupefaction of their minds with a mass of disordered material in all sorts of books and we may easily reach a condition justifying Festus' conception of a scholar—"Much learning hath made thee mad." But even though our learning end in chaos and our philosophy in a labyrinth which swallows up a larger tribute of choice youths and maidens than the Minotaur's, we may recover the doctrine of faith and works from farmers and fishermen, laborers and artisans, who hold it with a tenacity, and declare it with a conviction that is unshakable. These unsophisticated co-workers with nature often have a sense of life as it is which escapes the "forward-looking," loquacious, muddled 'prophets of the new era.'

The skepticism of the day is particularly hard to meet because it is so vague. It does not venture upon definite statement, but spreads itself in assumptions, in insinuations, in sneers at "crass dualism," in disparagement of earlier scholarship, in hints about the finalities of research, in ostentatious hospitality towards ideas of every

sort except those which the wisdom of ages has confirmed. The general lack of clear thinking produced by conscienceless instruction, by perfervid insincere rhetoric, by undigested masses of erudition, by the surrender of hard tasks, by an invertebrate humanitarianism seeking the paths of least resistance renders the correction of error nearly impossible. Then vague and erroneous ideals make the way of righteousness hard to follow and tempt men into the by-paths of ease and self-indulgence.

The philosophy of revolt has infected even some of our poetry. The music that once celebrated the hopes and aspirations of the spirit of man has become a savage growl for material possession without sweat of the face. This is not merely the outcry of the rabble in revolt against hopeless subjection; it expresses the temper of much of the educated and directing force in society. Owners of wealth and power repudiate restraint imposed by social custom on passions and savage impulses. While the middle class of society is emancipating itself from the curse of drunkenness the titled, educated and honored must have in their cellar the wine needed to maintain their standing as gentlemen. The habits of kings and generals and high ecclesiastics have recently been revealed by the stress of war, and their importance as leaders of custom, good or bad, has also been impressively demonstrated. How shall truthfulness be promoted among plain people if rulers disregard solemn treaties and humane laws, the long result of time? Corruption of society at the top is a sore menace to Christian living and Christian faith.

More insidiously still is the attack made on Christian morals by relaxation within the Church. Religious practice is in danger of finding itself presently in the condition of a jelly fish without a backbone. The attack usually begins on the traditional extravagances of Puritanism; then on the severity of our Pennsylvania blue laws; then on the strictness of family discipline to promote a quiet Sabbath for meditation and worship. Children must play; laborers must have relaxation; minds without amusement become stupid: then comes the assumption

that Sunday is the only day of the seven available for the purpose. The Rev. Dr. George Harris, ex-president of Dartmouth, in "A Century's Change in Religion," calls attention with distinct approval to the relaxation of sentiment with reference to dancing, theatre-going, card-playing and other forms of amusement, once frowned upon but now patronized by the Church. On the other side a penetrating judgment appears in recent words of the venerable banker, Gamaliel Bradford, eighth in descent from the Puritan governor: "Give the American people a great cause that they believe in [e. g. God's presence in the world] and they will sacrifice everything—time, wealth pleasure, luxury; but if they do not see the great cause, they will dally, dress, dance, spend, gossip, now dawdle over a Sunday paper, and now drive an automobile in mad hurry to get nowhere." From these two opinions taken together we may perhaps draw the inference that while such trifling activities are not declaratively unlawful they are certainly unworthy of the Christian.

#### FAITH AND EVOLUTION.

We are wedded these days to automatism and trust in machinery. We like to set the machinery in motion by touching a button and then go about our play. We have pinned our faith to the doctrine of evolution and indulge in the conceit that the world is necessarily growing better and that this is the best age in human history. Of course the present is better than the past; evolution demands it; our civilization spells it; no contradictory fact is worth the courtesy of consideration. Evolution rules in advanced theology; God himself is evolved from a mere tribal object of worship and gradually expanded into the conception of the universal Lord and Creator. It must not be admitted that primitive men had the large conception of God which is now current, else there could have been no such primitive men as our biology and sociology postulate, and what would become of our science?

All at once a voice of counter skepticism sounds from

the temple of science itself; William Bateson, President of the British Association for the Advancement of Science, last summer at Melbourne questioned the finality of Darwin and Spencer. Changes in species are wrought, not as they declared by accumulation of variations, but by elimination of qualities or factors, and the movement is towards simplicity—downward, not towards complexity—upward. Our complacency is disturbed; our faith in the ability of natural laws to carry us forward is weakened; the shock to our confidence in our growing goodness and perfection is intensified by the most savage and unjustifiable war in human history; and our frivolity is rebuked by the “great tribulation, such as was not since the beginning of the world to this time.”

Consciousness and observation both deny the fact of anything like spiritual evolution. If we lose contact with the Power above, even for a little while, we fail to unfold our religious life and wither; faith dies, or reverts into monism, naturalism, spiritualism or Christian Science. Society reverts as well as the individual; morals degenerate along with faith.

Few will question that the doubt cast upon the authenticity of Scripture by scientific dogmas, confidently proclaimed with a sneer for all who do not accept them, has narrowed the sphere of faith for many, destroyed respect for revelation and even shaken the fundamental belief in God. Weakened faith has eventuated in a conscience enfeebled with respect to the fundamental virtues. Science may improve our interpretation of the old Book, but it is not well to surrender too easily our confidence in its correctness. Entirely apart from any religious bearing, the picture of the ancient world attributed to Moses explains present conditions better than the guess of the latest sociologists. All things considered, it looks as if man had been on earth about as long as the Mosaic record indicates: the present numbers of the race and their rate of increase; their geographical distribution; their present command of physical conditions; the wearing of the continents by use and abuse fit better an occupancy of six or eight thousand years than an occupancy of two hundred



thousand. The search for missing links between man and lower organisms and confident generalizations about the natural upward development of the race have not been convincing to the reason or invigorating either to the devotional spirit or to conscience. More enervating still to the moral nature is denial of the divinity of Christ and the authority of the New Testament. The attenuated Christianity, with almost entire elimination of the supernatural, of the venerable author of "What I Believe and Why" may consist with a beautiful and benevolent life sheltered by fortune and affection, but it could hardly be a very positive force amid the struggles, jealousies and sordid cares of the average experience.

#### FAITH AND EDUCATION.

It must be assumed that a Christian Church, or better, a Christian State, desires to transmit its faith to succeeding generations. A capable and earnest ministry is of course the prime requisite. But what can the most consecrated accomplish in a few hours of a secularized Sabbath? What if, besides, the churches are poorly attended? What if, through the rest of the week, God is forgotten, truth is dishonored, luxury embraced, pleasure courted, oppression tolerated, tenderness frozen out, the big stick and the mailed fist flourished? What if society chooses as its ideal the man of Neanderthal, whose fist needs no mail, whose heart is like a piece of the nether millstone and whose cranium has no room for the conception of God and spirit? What if clamor and insistence engross all the attention of which the age is capable with praise of the practical, meaning always, the mammonish and unspiritual, and with contempt for what cannot be seen, heard or handled? What are the chances for religious growth under such conditions?

Much will depend upon the spirit of the schools. Even without formal Bible study in them a soil may be prepared so rich and deep that spiritual truth when implanted will flourish; contrariwise, great punctilio in religious training may leave the heart as barren as naked rock.

The best instruction, unostentatiously helpful to religion, vitalizes the benevolent affections, and roots out the malevolent as weeds. Make mental and spiritual culture the great thing from which all distractions are removed as far as possible. The abominable suggestion that the physically rather than the mentally unfit should be excluded from the universities was a woful lapse of judgment in a man commonly sane. The vocational courses with their time-consuming demands must cease to crowd into corners the subjects needed for the best comprehension of a world like this and must betake themselves to the vacations to which they are well fitted.

The spiritual part of man must come into its own again and be made paramount in determining what should be taught and how. Positively, even reputable scholars are losing the ability to think in terms of spirit. A professor in a historic university insists that the angels fell from Heaven under the force of gravity; a professor in another is ready to calculate the degrees of heat evolved where they struck! One might reasonably prefer the no more heretical state of mind of a student who when asked whether angels actually exist somewhat contemptuously replied: "No; they are merely the product of superstition." Words cannot express my gratitude that the teachers of my youth were men of faith, men tempered by the sobering influence of the Civil War, men of learning, too, among the foremost of a scholarly age. They distinguished between the lower knowledge and the higher, between that which ministered to physical needs and that which expanded the soul. The prince of them all merits special honor for having had the courage to say of economics, a science which he himself taught and which in these days is proclaimed as "priest and prophet of the Age of Enlightenment" that it was "the lowest almost of all the sciences." This was giving its proper rank to the knowledge which contributes chiefly to material welfare and which, these dismal days show, contributes even more to suffering and misery.

Of the teachers of our land in general it has been said by Dr. Washington Gladden, and observation confirms

the judgment, that their character is not surpassed by that of members of any other profession, the clerical not excepted. If any subtraction is to be made it must be some of the pampered occupants of chairs in the wealthy universities and their absurd imitators. Those who have entered the profession from our local institutions have been among the ablest, the most studious, the most honorable in the whole body of students. What they will be in the future will depend upon the maintenance of that supreme regard for God and truthfulness and that contempt for effeminacy and sham which were the ideals of the past. The teachers of primary and secondary grades in our public schools, with inferior advantages, do not seem to be any less conscientious in their service. All appear to be genuinely interested in the highest welfare of their pupils, and the nation's faith and morals seem at this time to be safe in their hands.

Boys and girls respond to good influence and instruction now no less than they did formerly. The distractions and disorganization from which they suffer are not their own fault, but are indecently imposed upon them by doctrinaires who prefer to try raw theories on the helpless. Within decent limits they should manage their own sports and amusements; conditions were better when they did. Not to the detriment but to the enlargement of innocent mirth, whose moral wholesomeness there is no disputing, more would be gained than lost by the elimination of athletics as now practiced; more also by the abandonment of the vaunted social culture so wasteful of time and money. The bitter rivalry on the contested field, with its sordid admixture of professionalism has in it little of the joy of healthful play and less that is promotive of good morals. The toxic atmosphere of the ball room, according to abundant recent testimony is immeasurably worse in its effect upon character and life. On the other hand, in spite of certain artificialities, not unpleasing in early youth, various juvenile societies, such as The Boy Scouts, The Knights of King Arthur, The Camp-fire Girls, and The Blue Birds, more or less detached from the Church, seem to be founded on a correct prin-

ciple. Their purpose, so far as it is clear to me, is to cultivate patriotic and humane sentiment, and in emergencies to offer intelligent service without pecuniary reward.

In summing up we may see with reference to the prospects of faith and good morals that some influences are favorable and some unfavorable. The latter arise from the things in which we take most pride and about which we make most noise, physical rivalry and material progress. The former appear in the protests, some in these institutions scarcely audible amid the din of worldliness, and the warnings, at times anonymous and of overwhelming earnestness, in our foremost literary magazines against the low ideals of the time. The chief business of life, from the stand-point of faith even more than the stand-point of culture is to familiarize our thinking with what lies behind the veil of sense. Nothing is gained by the training of the senses, if our hold is lost on the nobler knowledge. In many departments of life ideality is helpful, but in religion it is essential. Acceptance of the unseen strengthens the spiritual nature and has the Saviour's special benediction (John XX. 29). We may see in this a reason why men were forbidden to make images of the Deity. We may see why Christ did not remain on earth and allow a visible kingdom to be established, why it was better for his disciples that he should go away; he went to prepare a place for them, but no less did he thus prepare them for the place. For this, too, the invisible Spirit was substituted for the visible Christ, that men might be trained still further to believe and to live in the power of things beyond the reach of the senses. If conduct is the outcome of the inner life; if good works, as the Confession declares, are the fruits of faith, then it is supremely requisite that spiritual and intellectual enlargement shall be provided for in human society. For the attainment of this end no new measures are here proposed. The old faith is safe; its destination is known; let not Siren voices entice us away from it. Let the minister while he throws stress upon faith as his peculiar province continue to make the way of righteousness plain

and alluring; let the teacher in dealing with youth emphasize the beauty of the virtues and affections tracing their origin to the bosom of God; let both exalt and glorify the spiritual above the material, and the Son of Man when he cometh will find faith on the earth.

*Gettysburg, Pa.*

## ARTICLE II.

## THE PLACE OF ART IN WORSHIP.

BY PROFESSOR HERBERT C. ALLEMAN, D.D.

(Delivered May 20th, 1915, at the public presentation of the copy of da Vinci's "The Last Supper" painted by James B. Sword, Philadelphia, and given to the Theological Seminary at Gettysburg by Mr. and Mrs. Harvey C. Miller, Philadelphia, Pa.)

Peter and John went up to the Temple together, and, as they went, the author of the Acts of the Apostles tells us, they passed through the gate of the Temple which is called "Beautiful." It is doubtful if any thing more is meant to be conveyed by that statement than that there was one door in the Temple, probably an outer gate, so notable for its architectural charm that it received the name "Beautiful." Yet there is in this fact a truth of more than incidental importance. As the entering worshiper passed through this gate the beauty within burst upon his vision. Entering by the gate Beautiful he saw the whole Temple in its beauty. The gate was a worthy introduction to the vision on which it opened. The beautiful became the gateway to the divine.

In this respect Herod's temple was a parable in stone and brass. It is the parable that art comes to its true use when it becomes the gateway of worship. It was so employed by the greatest artists of the ancient world. The Parthenon of Athens and the Pantheon of Rome are shrines of deity. The masterpiece of Greek sculpture is the Olympian Zeus of Phidias, and, of Greek painting, the Aphrodite of Praxiteles. Socrates expressed the philosophy of ancient art when he said: "He who has learned to see the beautiful in due order and succession, when he comes to the end will suddenly perceive a nature of wondrous beauty—a nature which is everlasting, not growing and decaying, or increasing or waning, but beauty absolute and everlasting..... He who, rising

upwards, begins to see that beauty, is not far from the end. And the true order of going is to use the beauties of earth as steps along which he mounts upward for the sake of that final beauty . . . (to) bring forth not images, but realities, . . . to become the friend of God." The manner in which Socrates looked on beauty, as ranging from natural objects to the beauty of holiness, is full of meaning for us. Such beauty is more than a delight, it is a ministration, and our efforts to realize it are the instinctive goings forth of what is most divine in us toward Him of whom these earthly realities are but the shadow, the King eternal, immortal, invisible, of whose glory the heavens and the earth are full.

Without further developing the general thought we have here the justification of art in worship. Not simply music, but painting and sculpture are the handmaids of religion.

The origin of painting is unknown, but when it first emerges it is in the service of religion. The first important records of it are found in Egypt, carrying us back five millenniums and more. Egyptian life centered in the monarch, and the monarch was divine. Therefore to glorify the monarch and portray his acts was the first motive of Egyptian art. Massive towers symbolized deity, the painted and sculptured walls recited the divine deeds. They were written large that all might read; they were written in stone that they might endure. And so the artist became a historian as well as a decorator, by his symbolism photographing the conceptions of his day, by his technique handing them down to remote posterity. A similar motive animated Chaldeo-Assyrian painting. With the beauty-loving Greeks art became an end in itself, perfection of form and color without special regard for the subject; though here too art has preserved the religious conceptions of the people. Roman art was largely an imitation of that of Greece, being chiefly decorative in purpose, and it declined with the decline of Roman civilization. Out of this decaying Roman civilization arose the new life of Christianity. It was not welcomed by the Roman world which persecuted and at times



nearly exterminated it. It made its way slowly, handicapped as it was by many paganisms. The Christians of the Capital were Romans and inherited Roman tastes, manners and habits, living in houses like their neighbors—some of them, like Clement of Rome, possessing a patrician establishment. The decorations of these Roman homes constitute the most interesting remains of Roman art, as in Pompeii. But the earliest existing examples of Christian art are those applied not to houses but to burial places, after the custom of the times. The earliest Christian paintings appeared on the walls of the catacombs of Rome. The style of these paintings is bright and cheerful. Wreaths of fruits and flowers form a considerable part. Soon the religious motive asserted itself, though at first in a symbolic way. The cups and vases were marked with a fish because the Greek word *ἰχθῦς* gave the initials of the Christian confession of faith. The shepherd bearing a sheep or a lamb in the midst of the XII apostles, symbolized Christ. The anchor meant the Christian's hope; the phoenix, immortality; the cock, watchfulness; the ship, the church. It has been said that this form of art was due to persecution, but the sepulchre was exempt from sacrilege. It is more likely, on the authority of Van Dyke, that the representations were due to the fact that the Roman likeness seemed inadequate for the Lord, and they knew no other. But mere symbolism did not satisfy the popular need, and in time Christ appeared as a beardless youth in Phrygian costume or as Orpheus charming the animals of the wood. Nowhere as yet is Christ delineated in His humiliation. With Constantine, when Christianity was recognized as the national religion, Christian art came out of the catacombs and addressed itself to the task of decorating the vast interior wall-surfaces of the great basilican churches and the stately baptisteries which began to multiply. Now the new Capital of Christendom brought Christianity under the spell of oriental influences. Richness of material and of color supplant the classic form and symbolism of the first three centuries. Costly mosaic work abounds, human figures multiply, and the triumphant po-

sition of Christ is given an ideal treatment. One of the greatest and finest of these early mosaics is still to be seen in the ancient Church of St. Pudens in Rome, dating back to the fourth century. In the apse of the Church Christ is enthroned as teacher, surrounded by the XII apostles. The conception throws the apse into the heavenly sphere. In His hand the Lord holds a book on which is written *Conservator Ecclesiae Pudentionae*. Above the group and hovering in the air is a large cross studded with gems, the crown and not the shame of the Savior. There is still no scourging, no crowning with thorns, no taking down from the cross or burial. The influence of the East is shown in the fact that the figure of Christ is now older and bearded, while the marked difference in His physiognomy shows that there can have been no authentic tradition as to His actual appearance.

From this period (the fourth to the sixth centuries) can be dated the didactic purpose of Christian art. There is an often-quoted saying in early Christian writings that pictures are the books of those who cannot read. To the ecclesiastical mind this gave a religious justification of the pictorial embellishment of the walls of public buildings. The principle was laid down that the inner walls of a church should be covered with scenes from the Old and the New Testaments, in order that those who are unable to read may be reminded of the virtues of those who have kept the faith and won their crown, and thus be inspired to emulate their example. Gregory the Great recommended the use of pictures in the churches for the instruction of the illiterate. At the altar end of the church a painting of the Glorified Christ was to be found, along the sides were pictures from the Old and New Testaments, and, after the tenth century, the entrance wall, which was the Western, exhibited a scene of the Last Judgment. The educational advantage of art was offset, however, by the religious reverence paid the sacred effigies, and the iconoclastic controversy ensued. It was a long and bitter controversy and a deadly one for art. The ornamented walls were whitewashed and the sacred images were destroyed. For more than a century the

controversy waged with varying fortunes, but finally the rights of art were vindicated and it was accepted as the handmaid of worship. While in the East the iconoclastic controversy and Byzantine influence had put painting in a straightjacket, making artisans instead of artists, in the West Teutonic inroads broke up the fabric of antique culture and made the Middle Ages a long, unbroken night. Art was driven to the monasteries, but happily survived there until the Renaissance opened the door of a new era. The touch of the new awakening was felt everywhere, but nowhere more than in the painter's eye. The result was some of the sublimest conceptions of art in all the centuries, works which in their realm rival the poems of Homer and Virgil, Shakespeare and Milton. Among these notable creations of the Italian Renaissance in art was the painting of "The Last Supper" by Leonardo da Vinci. It was painted on the walls of the refectory of the convent of Santa Maria della Grazie, Milan, and was finished in the year 1498, when Martin Luther was a boy of fifteen. It measures 14.1 x 28.3 feet. Christ and the XII are seated on the farther side of a table, the other side of which is unoccupied. The apostles are divided into four groups of threes, into which they have been broken up by the electric shock of the words, "Verily, I say unto you that one of you shall betray me." Christ Himself remains majestic in His isolation. His eyes are bent downwards, His attitude showing how deeply He has felt His own words. At His right Peter is leaning across the traitor Judas to whisper in the ear of the youthful and beautiful John that he should ask Jesus whom He meant to designate. Peter is ardent and excited; John is sunk in sorrow. Judas shrinks back in dismay, his right hand clutching the bag, while his left, half raised from the table, betrays his surprise. Farther to the right Andrew is astounded and stupefied, James the Just touches Peter to tell Him that the traitor is at the table, while Bartholomew, uncertain and perplexed as to what he has heard, rises in a gesture of desire to be reassured by the Lord. At the left of Christ, James, the brother of John, is shrinking back with a gesture of hor-

ror and astonishment. Thomas doubts, repeating the words "One of us," his upraised index finger indicating his uncertainty that he is not meant. Philip protests his love and innocence. The last group includes Matthew, who repeats the Master's words, Thaddeus, who suspects the traitor, and Simon, who doubts that it can be possible. Almost every head, except that of Judas, which is thrown partly into shadow, presents a notable countenance. The apostles were painted from living models, "but not that of Christ," says Vesari, "for whom he did not wish to seek any earthly representative." After years of labor he left the head of Christ unfinished. His conception was unattainable.

The striking features of the original, as of our copy, are the faces of James and John, Peter and Andrew, Philip and Matthew, and the exquisite coloring. Owing to the accidents which befell the original from the elements and from vandals, the color has been restored several times. A door was cut through the wall just beneath the body of the Lord—by the monks, it is said, to facilitate their entrance from the kitchen. In 1797 Napoleon's soldiers used the refectory as a horse-stable and amused themselves by throwing bottles at the heads of the figures. But the color-scheme has been preserved intact, which is as follows: Jesus wears a mantle of old blue over a chiton of dull Tuscan red; John wears a brown mantle over a sage green chiton; Judas is clad in an olive green mantle over a pale blue chiton; Peter's mantle is blue; Andrew's, green over buff; James the Less, light red-brown; Bartholomew's, bluish sage green; Thomas', dull red and blue; James', light olive; Philip's, old rose with blue sleeves; Matthew's, blue; Thaddeus', light wood brown; Simon's, purple brown, over a grey vest.

The picture on our wall is a canvass, 23 x 6 1-2 feet in size. It was painted by Mr. James B. Sword, a well-known portrait painter of Philadelphia, in 1907-8. Mr. Sword charted his canvass from the engraving of Raphael Morghen and he adopted the color scheme of the copy of the Royal Academy, London, painted to reproduce da Vinci's original colors. Mr. Sword spent the

better part of a year in the execution of his canvass. The picture was designed for a church of the artist's faith and was painted by a devout hand. All the figures are after living models. By competent critics it is considered one of the best reproductions of da Vinci's original in existence. I can testify that from the standpoint of religious feeling it is superior to the two reproductions which hang in the old refectory at Milan. It now becomes the treasured possession of our Seminary by the generous donation of Mr. and Mrs. Harvey C. Miller of Philadelphia, in whose name I formally present it. When, for reasons which do not here concern us, the picture was thrown on the market, it was secured by Mr. and Mrs. Miller for the express purpose of placing it here. It was thought that this chapel afforded a fitting home for it, a thought shared by the artist himself whose satisfaction in seeing it in position it is pleasant to recall. The picture is given to the Seminary as a part of its equipment, thus making a unique addition to the cultural influences of the institution. Its ministries must multiply with the years. In this place of prayer, where, morning and evening the student body assembles for worship, what could be more helpful, for the purposes of self-examination, than the silent challenge of that tragic moment in the progress of the Last Supper in the Upper Room when, as the Master and the XII were eating, He said, "Verily, I say unto you that one of you shall betray me?" There are undiscovered capacities for baseness in the best of us. "Who can understand his errors? Cleave thou me from hidden faults." With the prayer that the picture may perform this ministry of saving and sanctifying suggestion, and that this work of art may be a Gate Beautiful to the Temple of God, in the name of the donors I transmit this canvass to the possession of the Seminary.

*Gettysburg, Pa.*

## ARTICLE III.

## PULPIT PRAYER.

BY PROFESSOR JACOB A. CLUTZ, D.D.

Probably no other part of the average church service is so often unsatisfactory to both pastor and people as the prayers. There is probably no other part of the service from which the average minister so shrinks, or to which he goes with so much fear and trembling, or which he so gladly puts off on some one else whenever possible. Yet, certainly, we will all agree that prayer is one of the most important parts of the service, and that it ought to be one of the most delightful and most helpful.

Especially is all this true of what is commonly known as "the long prayer," or more properly "the general prayer," whether it be offered before or after the sermon. The other prayers, such as the Invocation and the Confession, &c., are comparatively short and simple and are generally easily managed. They deal with only one leading idea. Moreover, they are generally read from the liturgy. Even the short prayer which usually follows the sermon when the general prayer precedes it, is seldom much of a stumbling block to either pastor or people, though doubtless it also might often be much more helpful than it is.

The reading of the service is a simple and easy matter, if the minister is familiar with it, as of course every minister ought to be. He does not have much difficulty with the reading of the Scripture lesson, or lessons, though it must be confessed that this is often very badly done. The sermon has generally been prepared with some degree of care, and hence this is undertaken with considerable assurance. But it is that long, or general prayer that is the *bête noir* of so many ministers, probably of a majority of them. It is this that makes cowards of many, if not of all. Probably those who do not dread it more

or less, are the very ones who should dread it most, because they fail in it most seriously. They do not shrink from it because they do not appreciate its importance, and the demands which it makes on a man's very best and highest powers, or because they do not realize their own limitations.

As a rule, if the preacher has a friend or an assistant with him in the pulpit, he will ask him to offer the general prayer, rather than to take any other part of the service. As a rule also, that is the very part of the service which the friend or helper will try to avoid. He will do anything else rather than that, conduct the opening service, read the lessons, even take up the offering. Many would rather preach the sermon than to offer prayer. At a public service, when a number of ministers are present, it is often almost impossible to get any one to consent to offer the prayer. As president of the Alumni Association of the Seminary here at Gettysburg, the writer of this, has sometimes been obliged to ask five or six men before securing the consent of one to offer the prayer at the annual meeting.

Perhaps this may be as good a place as any to raise the question of read prayers. If the offering of free prayer is such a burden to the minister, and is so often unsatisfactory both to him and to the congregation, why, it may be asked, would it not be better for the minister to read the prayer found in the Service Book, with such additional collects as may be found necessary to adapt it to the occasion, or to the specific needs of the congregation? No doubt much may be said in favor of read prayers, much more than the average non-liturgist would suppose. We may go farther than this, and say that it would probably be well for most ministers, if not for all, to read the prayers found in the liturgy at least sometimes. But at the same time, we believe that it would be a great mistake, and a great loss, if our ministers generally were to surrender the privilege, or shirk the duty, of leading their congregations in free prayer. We believe that it would be a serious loss to both ministers and people. We believe that the whole service would be likely to fall to a



lower level of devotion and spirituality. It is a question whether even the sermon itself would not suffer a loss of earnestness and unction. As Dr. Talling says, in his book on *Extempore Prayer*, "If worship is to sanctify the whole life it must be an exercise in thinking, a personal fellowship with God."<sup>1</sup> It is difficult, if not impossible, to realize this high ideal while using the words of another, especially while reading prayers from a book, even though it be from a service that has been hallowed by centuries of use and by the devotion of many congregations. As Dr. Talling says again, "Free prayer may rarely possess the perfect exterior of a formula, but it has a fervor and warmth, a spontaneity and contagion unfelt in constant repetition."<sup>2</sup> This "contagion" and this "fervor and warmth," are likely to be communicated to all the other parts of the service, and they are likely to suffer loss if these are not present. It was doubtless the consciousness and the oft repeated experience of this that led an old minister, when asked whether he wished some one to offer the general prayer when he was to do the preaching, to reply, "No, I will offer the prayer myself; I like to whet my own scythe."

In addition to this, we must recognize the fact that in the great majority of our General Synod churches the reading of the general prayer would be objectionable, and even offensive, to many if not to all of the people, and therefore most unprofitable and unwise. However unsatisfactory, and even unprofitable in many cases, the free prayer may be, the read prayer would be even more so. Some may pronounce this narrowness, and prejudice, and even bigotry, and perhaps justly so, but whatever we may call it, it is a fact and cannot be ignored by the minister who would make the services of the sanctuary really helpful to his people, and who as a true pastor, or shepherd, to them, would lead them into the green pastures and beside the still waters of a true spiritual communion and fellowship with God in prayer.

We turn now, therefore, to inquire why the office of

<sup>1</sup> *Extempore Prayer, its Principles, Preparation and Practice.* By Marshall P. Talling, Ph.D. Page 24.

<sup>2</sup> *Idem*, Page 24.

public prayer should be so irksome, and how, if at all, it can be made easier and more delightful, or at least more satisfactory to both pastor and people. Many reasons might be given in answer to the first question. Among the more important of them are probably such as these:

First, that the offering of public prayer is really a very difficult task for most men, even for most ministers. A few men seem to be especially gifted in prayer. We have in mind two men, especially, both now of blessed memory, to whom public prayer always seemed to be a delight. It certainly was a delight and a great privilege to hear them pray, and to be led by them to the throne of grace. Their manner was so devout, their thought was so rich and spiritual, their language was so simple and so direct, that they seemed at once to enter into the secret place of the Almighty, into the very holy of holies, and there to commune with God face to face. What is more to the point, they seemed to be able to lead the whole congregation to the same holy place, and into the same blessed communion. Doubtless our readers will recall others who possessed the same great and precious gift. And yet it is a question whether this unusual facility and power in prayer was not the result of painstaking effort and of long practice, rather than of any extraordinary gifts.

Public prayer is very different from private prayer. It is different in form, in content and in manner. In private prayer we stand alone, face to face with God. There are only the two factors, God and the individual soul. Hence we can open our hearts to him and lay bare our inmost souls, all our deepest desires, our secret thoughts, all our weaknesses and failures and sins, as well as all our hopes and fears, our longings and aspirations, everything that concerns either our inner or our outer being. Indeed we know that all these things are "naked and opened" in his eyes even before we begin. We need have no hesitation, therefore, no embarrassment. We need not have much concern about the form of our prayers, about the language, or the arrangement or about anything else except to be sincere. We simply draw near to

God and open our hearts to him in childlike confidence and faith.

In public prayer it is very different, especially in pulpit prayer. Here the minister does not speak for himself only. In a sense, he does not speak for himself at all except as one of the congregation. He is now acting in an official capacity. He is now leading the worship of the congregation. His function is now a priestly one, not in the sense of being a mediator between men and God, but as gathering up in himself, and exercising for the time being, the priestly function of the whole congregation. Or, perhaps we should say rather, that he is now leading the congregation in the discharge of the priestly function which belongs to them all, for he does not pray for them, but with them, or they with him. He simply leads them in prayer. They are supposed to follow him, to pray with him, not only by saying "Amen" at the close, but by adopting as their own every sentiment that he utters, whether of adoration, or confession, or thanksgiving, or petition, or intercession.

This is what makes the minister's task so difficult in pulpit prayer. If the congregation is to pray with him, then he must offer such prayer as the people can join in. He must think their thoughts, or such thoughts as they can and ought to think after him. He must lift their hearts in adoration and praise. He must help them to give expression to their penitence and to confess their sins. He must lead them in the declaration of their faith, in expressing their gratitude, in making their petitions, in uttering their supplications. In short he must help them to worship God, who is a spirit, in spirit and in truth.

When the minister remembers all this he may well tremble at the task which is before him. The average congregation, in the average church service, is in itself a miniature world. It is made up of all sorts and conditions of men, women and children. There are the aged and the young, the rich and the poor, the well and the sick, the happy and the sad, the hopeful and the discouraged. There are some who are strong and confident, and

who desire nothing but to be let alone in their strength to carry on their enterprises to a successful issue. There are others who have been beaten in the battle of life, who are weak and cast down and ready to give up in despair. There are those who have many burdens to bear, those who are sorely tried and tempted, those who have been overcome by the enemy and who are afraid even to ask God's forgiveness. How shall the minister lead all these in prayer, and do it so that they can really follow him, and pray with him and through him? Naturally such a prayer must be more formal than a private prayer. It calls for more careful thought, for greater care in the choice of words, in the arrangement of sentences, in the order of the topics presented, and in everything connected with it.

A second thing that makes prayer difficult with some ministers, it is to be feared, is the neglect of private prayer. There are many temptations to this for the minister. These temptations grow out of the very nature of his work, out of his constant familiarity with sacred things, out of his many engagements, out of his always thinking of and working for others, &c. If he yields to them, and neglects the practice of private prayer even occasionally, this neglect will surely bring weakness into his work in the sanctuary, especially when he tries to lead his people in their approach to God in prayer. The stream can rise no higher than its source, and the springs from which the stream of public prayer is fed, and which give it depth and sweep of current, are to be found in the minister's study and in the faithfulness and joy with which he holds private communion with God. If he is not a man of prayer in private, he will lack the spirit of real devotion, and also the language of devotion in public prayer. It will be evident at once that he is on unfamiliar ground and walking in unfamiliar ways. He will be using an unfamiliar tongue, and naturally he will proceed haltingly and uncertainly. It is reported that Paderewski, the great Polish pianist, once said that if he should allow a single day to pass without practice on the piano he would notice the effect in his playing in public,

that if he should fail to practice for two days his friends would notice it, and that if he should neglect practice for three days the whole world would know it. Something of this same kind is true of the neglect of private prayer, and of the effect of such neglect on a minister's prayers in public. Spurgeon says, "Habitual communion with God must be maintained, or our public prayers will be vapid and formal. If there is no melting of the glacier high up in the ravines of the mountain, there will be no descending rivulets to cheer the plain. Private prayer is the drill ground for our more public exercises, neither can we long neglect it without being out of order when before the people."<sup>3</sup> If a minister would be strong in public prayer he must never let the grass of neglect grow on the path to his closet of secret prayer, nor permit its door to rust on its hinges because of disuse.

A third source of weakness in public prayer may be found in the very common failure to use oral speech in private prayer. The stream of thought is simply allowed to flow through the mind without the use of formal language. Sometimes this may be the result of sheer indolence, but more likely it comes from the desire for absolute privacy.

No doubt much may be said in favor of this method of praying in private. Why should we pray aloud when we are alone with God and there is no one to hear but him? He can read our thoughts as well as hear our words. Moreover, the very effort to express our thoughts in spoken words may seem to distract the mind from the real exercise of prayer. Besides, we may be overheard by persons in the next room, or elsewhere in the house, or even on the street. Thus the privacy of our devotions would seem to be violated, and we might hesitate to utter all that would be in our hearts.

There is no little force in such reasoning. Of course, so far as God is concerned, oral speech is not necessary. He understandeth our thoughts afar off, and knoweth all the desires of our hearts before we ask him. Montgomery was entirely right when he sang,

3 Lectures to My Students, page 55.

Prayer is the soul's sincere desire,  
Uttered or unexpressed,  
The motion of a hidden fire  
That trembles in the breast.

Prayer is the burden of a sigh,  
The falling of a tear;  
The upward glancing of an eye  
When none but God is near.

At the same time, does it not seem more fitting that when we go to God, our heavenly Father, in prayer and worship even in private, we should take the trouble to put our prayers into the form of actual speech with him?

Be this as it may, we certainly must lose much of the benefit of private prayer, in so far as it becomes a preparation for public prayer, when we fail to use oral speech. We do not become accustomed to the sound of our own voices in prayer. We do not learn to use the proper tones of prayer. We do not so readily acquire the language of prayer, or improve in the use of it. There are many ways in which the habit of careful vocal expression in our private devotions will assist us in leading the congregation in prayer in public worship.

But no doubt the chief hindrance to success in public prayer is the lack of preparation for it, both general and special. It may seem strange, at first, that so little attention should be given to this very important part of the minister's work, either in the seminary or after men are out in active work. The student in the seminary is taught almost everything else, or at least an effort is made to teach him. Preaching, and pastoral work, and Sunday School work, and the work among the young people, and the work of Missions, all of these and it may be a score of other things, receive due attention, or at least such attention as the limited time will permit. But very few seminaries, we suspect, have a regular course in public prayer. Ordinarily, the most that is attempted is a lecture or two in connection with Pastoral Theology. When the young minister leaves the seminary and takes

charge of a congregation he will usually make careful preparation for the work of preaching because he has been taught to do this and he realizes the importance of it. He may even carefully select his lessons and his hymns, and study them so that he can read them effectively. But seldom, we fear, does he make any adequate preparation for the office of public prayer either in his Sunday or his mid-week services.

We have said that this might seem strange at first thought. But on second thought, it does not seem so surprising after all. The fact is that the prevailing conception of prayer, even in the ministry, is such that any proposition of special training for it, or even of special preparation, seems almost like sacrilege or blasphemy. It seems like laying profane hands on holy things, or like bringing down the highest and most sacred and solemn exercises of the human mind and heart to the level of an ordinary secular trade or task. It is felt that prayer is such a high and holy thing, that it is such an intimate and peculiar exercise, that it ought to be purely spontaneous like a mother's love for her babe, that a man in prayer should utter not what may have been suggested as the result of previous study or preparation, but just what his heart may prompt at the time and as the Spirit gives him utterance.

With such a conception of prayer, it is easy to see why men should naturally shrink from either general or special preparation for it. But this is a wrong conception at least of public prayer. It may be more largely true of private prayer in which God and the individual soul are the only persons concerned. But in public prayer there is a third party, the congregation, and its interests and rights must be respected and conserved. This involves a grave responsibility, as we have already seen. This congregation may embrace fifty, or a hundred, or five hundred, or a thousand or more human beings, with all their different and sometimes conflicting interests, with all their varied experiences, with all their multitudinous needs both temporal and spiritual. To gather up all these into one stream of devotion, to lead them all to-



gether to their common Father, to give expression to all that is in their hearts, or to awaken and lead them to the proper exercise of all the functions of true prayer, surely this is an office of such tremendous importance and responsibility that it would seem to call for, and even to demand, the most careful preparation both general and special, of which any minister is capable. We are not surprised that Henry Ward Beecher said, "Hundreds and hundreds of times, as I rose to pray and glanced at the congregation, I could not keep back the tears. There came to my mind such a sense of their wants, there were so many hidden sorrows, there were so many weights and burdens, there were so many doubts, there were so many states of weakness, there were so many dangers, so many perils, there were such histories,—not world histories, but eternal-world histories,—I had such a sense of compassion for them, my soul so longed for them, that it seemed to me as if I could scarcely open my mouth to speak for them."<sup>4</sup> Every true pastor, every true shepherd of souls, must have something of this same feeling when he comes to lead his congregation in prayer. How then can he help feeling also the need of the most careful preparation for such an office?

We have spoken of general and also of special preparation for public prayer. Under general preparation three things at least require attention. They are the nature, the content, and the structure of public prayer.

Of the nature of public prayer we have already written pretty fully, especially of the difference between private and public prayer. Of prayer in general, we know no better definition than the one found in our Lutheran Catechism, "Prayer is the conversation of the heart with God, uttered or unexpressed." Many more elaborate definitions have been given. This one is from the Shorter Catechism, "Prayer is an offering up of our desires unto God, for things agreeable to His will, in the name of Christ, with confession of our sins, and thankful acknowledgment of his mercies." Professor Talling proposes this as a definition of prayer, "Prayer is communion

4 Yale Lectures on Preaching, Second Series, page 46.

with God, wherein we adore Him, confessing our sins, thank Him for mercies received, and under the Holy Spirit's influence ask for things agreeable to His will; and all in the name of Christ."<sup>5</sup> Both of these, however, are descriptions of the content of prayer rather than definitions of prayer itself. There is one thing, however, which Dr. Talling's definition makes clear, and which should not be forgotten. It is the fact that normally prayer is offered to God the Father, in the name of God the Son, under the inspiration or with the assistance of God the Holy Spirit.

We say, this is the normal relation of the three persons of the Trinity to the office of prayer. This does not mean, however, that prayer can never be addressed to the Son or the Holy Spirit. Prayer may be addressed to any one of the three persons of the Trinity, or to all three of them. There is Scriptural warrant for this, and the Church has always recognized and used this privilege.

It may be added, however, that when we pray to the separate persons of the Trinity, our prayers should have special reference to the office of that particular person in the Trinity. Thus, we attribute especially to the Father the work of creation and preservation, to the Son the work of redemption and salvation, and to the Holy Spirit the work of enlightenment and awakening, conversion and sanctification, &c. But we should never forget the truth that though we recognize three persons in the Trinity, there is after all only one God, and that therefore all our prayers are, in the last analysis, addressed to all three persons because the three are one.

Under the content of prayer we shall consider the different parts of prayer, or its constituent elements. These are given quite variously by different writers depending somewhat on the fullness with which the subject is discussed, and the consequent degree of minuteness of analysis. But nearly all writers recognize at least five principal elements, adoration, confession, thanksgiving, petition, and intercession.

By adoration is meant the ascription to God of those

5 Extempore Prayer, page 29.

titles, or attributes, or works, which express or exhibit the perfection and glory of his being and character, His absolute dominion over all the works of His hands, and the dependence of all creatures and of all things, on His power and will for the beginning and the continuance of their existence and for the supply of all their wants.

By confession is meant the humble and sincere acknowledgment of our unworthiness and sinfulness before him, including of course the prayer for forgiveness and reconciliation, and for deliverance from both the guilt and the power, as well as from the penalty of sin.

By thanksgiving is meant the full, hearty and grateful recognition of God's goodness and mercy in all his dealings with us, the preservation of life and of health and strength of body and of mind, and all the material good with which he crowns our years. Especially should we thank and praise Him for all those richer gifts of His grace which are connected with our redemption and salvation, and our hope of eternal life.

In petition we lay our wants before Him, and make our requests to Him for all those temporal and spiritual blessings and gifts which we need daily and hourly, not only for our continuance in life, but also for our comfort and happiness in life, and to enable us to fulfill the functions of life and to discharge its duties, perform its tasks, meet its responsibilities, and thus properly to serve God and our fellowmen.

In intercession we make similar requests in behalf of others, our friends and loved ones, our neighbors and companions, the city, the State and the Nation, and all men. Here we remember all the interests of the Church and of society and pray for the success of every good cause, and of all the efforts which good men are putting forth to make the world better, and to bring in and establish the kingdom of our God and of His Christ.

It might have been expected that praise would also be named as one of the constituent elements of prayer. The reason why it is not is that praise is usually expressed in song, and because in so far as it is a necessary or fitting

element of prayer it may very properly be included under either adoration or thanksgiving.

The order in which these five elements have been named seems also to be the natural or logical order. When we draw near to God we naturally desire, first of all, to remind ourselves of, and to express to Him, our deep sense of His greatness and glory, His wisdom and power, the infinite perfection of all His attributes and of the unsullied purity and holiness of His character, and of our entire dependence on Him for all that we have, and are, and hope to be. This is adoration.

Such a vision of God must awaken within us a sense of our finite imperfection and limitations in contrast, and especially a sense of our unworthiness to approach such a pure and holy God because of our sin and guilt. Hence we are led to confession, just as Isaiah's vision of the majesty and glory of Jehovah in the temple constrained him to cry out, "Woe is me! for I am undone; because I am a man of unclean lips, and I dwell in the midst of a people of unclean lips; for mine eyes have seen the King, Jehovah of hosts."<sup>6</sup> Or, just as Job, after all his vehement assertions of his own righteousness of heart and life in reply to the open or veiled accusations of his friends, when finally God came to him in the whirlwind and spoke to him, cried out, "I had heard of Thee by the hearing of the ear; but now mine eye seeth Thee: wherefore I abhor myself, and repent in dust and ashes."<sup>7</sup> Or just as Peter, when convinced of our Lord's divine wisdom and power by the miraculous draft of fishes, fell at His feet and exclaimed, "Depart from me; for I am a sinful man, O Lord."<sup>8</sup>

Having thus confessed our sins and appropriated God's promise of forgiveness to all who sincerely repent and make confession, the next movement of our minds and hearts will naturally be towards the grateful recollection of all God's goodness and mercy, and the expression of our gratitude in words of thanksgiving and praise. Like

6 Isaiah VI:1-5.

7 Job XLII:5, 6.

8 Luke V:8.

the Psalmist, we will now be constrained to cry, "Bless Jehovah, O my soul; and all that is within me bless His holy name. Bless Jehovah, O my soul, and forget not all His benefits."<sup>9</sup> Along with this will naturally go some enumeration of the rich and wonderful blessings and gifts, both temporal and spiritual, which are continually coming to us from our Father in heaven.

From this we will turn just as naturally and spontaneously to the thought of our continued and constant need of His fatherly watch and care, and of the supply of all our multiplied wants. This will prompt us to pour out our hearts to Him in earnest and humble petition for all needed good, whether for the body or for the soul.

But if we are true Christians we can never be satisfied with our own fulness, or with the presentation of our own needs. We will want to pray for our friends and neighbors, for our Christian brethren in this land and in other lands, for our nation and for other nations, for the world. We will want to pray for the sick and afflicted, for the poor and the needy, for the sorrowing and the distressed, for the oppressed and the downtrodden, for every condition of men. We will want to pray for the Church and for all her institutions and agencies and work. We will want to pray for every good cause, for everything and for all men, that are helping to bring in the kingdom of God and establish it in the earth. This is intercession, and thus we complete the circuit of the consistent elements of public prayer.

It is not to be understood, however, that all five of these distinctive parts must of necessity be present in every prayer, nor that, when present, they must necessarily occur always in just this order. Neither can there be any absolute law or rule to determine the exact proportion of each, or the precise amount of time that is to be given to each. In free prayer there must be genuine freedom, but without permitting this freedom to run into license. The taste and good judgment of the minister, the condition and needs of the congregation, and the peculiar demands of the occasion, must all be considered

9 Psalm 103:1, 2.

and allowed to have due weight. Under the control of such considerations, it is easy to see how on some occasion some one or two of the elements named may be given a dominant place in the prayer, even to the exclusion of some of the others, or of all of them. For a like reason the order of arrangement may sometimes be changed. Thus, where there has been a formal confession of sin in the opening service, this element will naturally require a much smaller place in the general prayer, or may even be omitted entirely. All that we wish to insist on is, that the five elements named are the normal elements of pulpit prayer, and that the order in which they have been named is the normal order.

In the interests of simplicity some have proposed to reduce the formal parts to four. They do this by uniting petition and intercession under the common term of supplication. It has been suggested also that by doing this a simple mnemonic word may be used to assist the minister in keeping in mind the several parts of prayer, and also their logical order. The word suggested is "Acts"; A standing for adoration, c for confession, t for thanksgiving, and s for supplication. The objection to this is that it must still be remembered that supplication has two parts, petition and intercession. The subject is thus complicated rather than simplified. The only real advantage is in the use of the mnemonic word, "Acts," and this is a doubtful gain under the circumstances.

Under the structure of pulpit prayer we wish to discuss the form and content to be given to each individual prayer. This implies that the prayers should not all be alike from service to service and from Sunday to Sunday all the year round. If the minister is to use the same prayer, or even substantially the same, at every service, embracing the same parts, and expressing the same ideas in the same language, he would far better read his prayers at once. He would lose nothing in variety, and he would probably gain much in form and expression, and in devotional spirit. It is possible to put life into a read prayer that is rich in historical associations, and in devotional language. It is possible to make such a prayer

our own and therefore a real prayer. But a stereotyped form of words, repeated over and over, again and again, in every service, under the name of free prayer, beginning and continuing and ending, every time, in exactly the same way, becomes so formal and so dead, that no life can be put into it either by the man who recites it, or by the people who hear it.

But if there is to be variety and adaptation in prayer, then there must be preparation for it, not only general preparation, but special preparation for each individual prayer. The minister must take time and pains to think what he is to pray for at this particular time, and how he is to express his thoughts. He must recall what his prayers have been for at least several services preceding. He must keep in mind the nature of the service which is just before him, if it has any special features, or the subject of the sermon. He must have in mind the peculiar circumstances of his people, and their peculiar interests and needs at just that time. He must ask whether there have been any special happenings among them, or in the community, that will be in all minds and that will call for special mention in prayer. He must also have a large vision of any general interests of the Church, or of the nation, or of humanity, that should be remembered and made the subject of prayer.

In this way he will get a summary of the things that he ought to pray about. Then he should arrange these into some kind of logical order, and decide how much attention shall be given to each, and perhaps even compose in his mind, or by writing, the exact language which he shall use. This need not destroy the spontaneity of his prayer. It will not lessen its spirituality or its fervency. It certainly will not interfere with its helpfulness to the people. It will be far more likely to increase all these at the same time that it will save the prayer from being a mere rambling rhapsody, and will make it a true prayer.

We turn now to the discussion of some common faults in pulpit prayer.

1. *Praying too long.* It used to be the custom for ministers to pray fifteen or twenty minutes, or even a



half hour or more. But that was in the days of the Puritans and their successors, when the sermon frequently lasted from one to two hours, and on some occasions three hours. There was then no undue disproportion between the prayers and the sermons, and the audiences were quite willing to endure both. Indeed, they would have felt disappointed, and defrauded of their just dues, if either had been cut down to the requirements of the present day. Of course, it is possible even now to make the prayer too short, but it is safe to say that very few ministers offend in this way. There is no rule that is mandatory or absolute. But from five to eight minutes seems to be generally recognized as a suitable length. Few congregations will find fault with a general prayer that is kept within these limits, but if it goes much beyond them there is likely to be a good deal of restlessness and confusion, indicating that the interest and devotion of the people have flagged, or been entirely exhausted.

2. *Making the prayer too general.* The cure for this evil is found in such preparation as has already been suggested. Even a few minutes given to earnest thought, and to mapping out a plan of prayer, will usually save the prayer from desultoriness, and direct it to some definite subjects or ends that will give it point and interest. Especially is this true of those topics of prayer which grow out of the immediate circumstances or needs of the congregation, or of individual members of it. Dr. R. W. Dale has a fine passage on this subject in his closing lecture for the Yale Series for 1877-'8. It is too long for quotation, as a whole, but we venture to give a few sentences. "There is always sin to be confessed, sorrow which God alone can soothe and comfort, weakness that needs divine support; and there is always happiness for which we should offer thanksgiving. But we must be very indolent or else we must be cursed with a dull and unsympathetic nature, if we are satisfied with a vague and general remembrance of the sin, the sorrow, the weakness, the joy, which cloud or brighten the lives of our people. In our preparation for our public prayers

we should think of the people one by one, and make all their trouble and all their gladness our own."<sup>10</sup>

3. *Making the prayer too personal.* Some ministers make it a practice to mention names in their prayers, and to give such minute details of the experiences of the persons or families referred to, as to make it very embarrassing to them if present, and sometimes even when absent. Such public advertisement of their joys or their sorrows may be pleasing to some people, and may help to make the pastor popular with them. But really refined and sensitive people will be shocked and offended by it. It would be going too far, perhaps, to say that the pastor should never mention the names of persons prayed for. But certainly it should very seldom be done. The Lord is not so dull, or so uninformed, that He needs to be told exactly who is meant in prayer, or to be given all the details of their joys or sorrows. Neither is it necessary that the people should be made acquainted with all these particulars in order to unite in the prayer. Sometimes requests are made for the prayers of the congregation in behalf of some one that is sick, or for some family that is in sore distress. In such cases the request can be announced before prayer is offered, or they can be prayed for specifically but still without mentioning names.

4. *Repetitiousness.* Some preachers seem to be unable to get away from an idea, or to let it go, when once they have touched on it in prayer. They state it over and over in slightly different phraseology. They return to it again and again. They hover about like a bee about a flower, or like a moth about a flame. They hang over it like a mother over her babe, until the people are tempted to wish that it had never been born. This comes dangerously near the "vain repetitions" of the heathen which our Lord especially exhorts us to avoid. There should be progress in prayer as well as in preaching. Neither our sins, nor God's good gifts, nor our needs, nor the needs of others, are so few that we need to spend all our time dealing with any single one of them.

<sup>10</sup> Nine Lectures on Preaching. By R. W. Dale, D.D., pages 267-270.

There is such a thing as importunity in prayer, when our hearts are burdened with a single desire for ourselves or for others, and when it is fitting that we should dwell on the thing and cling to God as Jacob did at Jabbok, unwilling to let him go until he hears and answers us. But this is more likely to occur in private prayer than in public.

5. *The use of too ambitious language.* It was such a prayer, doubtless, that a reporter is said to have characterized for his paper as "the most eloquent prayer ever delivered to a Boston audience." We have all heard such prayers, made up of great swelling words, abounding in similes and metaphors, and full of turgid rhetoric, that were evidently intended for the ears of the congregation rather than for the ear of God. It hardly needs be said that all this is entirely out of place in prayer. The language of prayer should be simple and direct, as the true language of the heart always is. Spurgeon says, "It is little short of blasphemy to make devotion an occasion for display. In the presence of the Lord of Hosts it ill becomes a sinner to parade the feathers and finery of tawdry speech with the view of winning applause from his fellow mortals."<sup>11</sup>

6. *The too frequent use of trite and common-place words and phrases that have been worn thin and thread-bare by the constant repetition of many generations.* There is a large stock of such words and phrases. Once they may have been full of meaning and instinct with life and devotion. But now they are dead and empty forms, mere sounding brass and tinkling cymbals. They have lost their meaning and force, and should be given a well-earned rest. The remedy for this fault is to be found in the cultivation of the language as well as the proper ideas of prayer. This may be done by committing suitable parts of the Bible, by studying the prayers of the Church as they are found in her venerable liturgies, by studying the prayers of other ministers who have had special gifts in this direction or have given much attention to it.

Professor Talling suggests the study of synonyms as

<sup>11</sup> Lectures to My Students, page 56.

a means of enriching our prayer vocabulary and avoiding the inane and wearisome repetition of the same words and phrases. He says, "It will be found most helpful to examine the synonyms of the chief terms used in worship. Merely to read them over is instructive. Take the word 'pray'; which some repeat over and over again in devotion, whereas many kindred terms are available, the use of which would be more expressive and graceful, and exhibit much richer thought. Look at this partial list: We pray, beg, ask, petition, request, solicit; we entreat, beseech, supplicate, implore, invoke; we cry, crave, hunger, thirst, long for, etc." He adds very truly that "a few hours devoted to this exercise early in life will enrich a man's entire subsequent ministry."<sup>12</sup> The man who would follow this advice would never be guilty of beginning every petition of his entire prayer with the words "Wilt thou," as one of our professors was wont to do when the writer was a student in College.

7. *The too frequent use of the names, or titles, of the Deity.* This is close akin to the fault last referred to, but is important enough to deserve separate mention. This fault is aggravated when it is the same name or title that is repeated over and over in almost every sentence. Sometimes it is, "O God;" sometimes it is "O Lord;" sometimes it is "Lord God." Or it may be "Our Father in heaven," or "heavenly Father," or "Lord Jesus," or "dear Jesus." It makes little difference what it is, if it is repeated too often, and especially if it is used so frequently that the hearers begin to count the number of times it is used in the same prayer, it becomes a most serious defect. There is no necessity for the frequent use of any of the names or titles of God in prayer. The prayer is addressed to God at the beginning, and it ought not to be necessary to keep repeating his name to remind us to whom we are speaking. When there is some pronounced change of form or topic, as when we pass from adoration to confession, or from confession to thanksgiving, &c., it may be proper to use again some name of God, or when some especially

<sup>12</sup> Extempore Prayer, page 164.

important idea is introduced. Even then we should vary the form of address. There are so many names and titles of the supreme being that there can be no excuse for the monotonous repetition of any one of them.

Perhaps it would be well to say something in this connection of the proper address to God to use in beginning a prayer. There is no one form which is proper on all occasions, though many ministers have a stereotyped form of words which they uniformly use. With some it is "Our Father who art in heaven," taken from the Lord's Prayer; with others it is "Our heavenly Father" which is only another form of the same address. Others begin with, "Lord God," or "Lord God Almighty," &c. All of these are appropriate enough in themselves, but it is doubtful whether any one of them is appropriate for all occasions. It would seem to be better to study some variety even in this, and to adapt our opening address to the general character of the prayer to be offered. Professor Talling may be quoted here again, "God has many attributes and many names. Every name has a significance peculiar to itself. Use therefore the title most suitable for the sort of prayer or the special petition presented.....Is the dominant note thanksgiving? Then we think of God as Creator, Preserver, Redeemer, Bountiful Benefactor, our Father, etc. Is our cry for protection or help? It is natural to think of God as Almighty, or Omnipotent, Immanuel, Our Refuge, Rock, Tower, Deliverer, etc."<sup>13</sup>

8. *Over familiarity.* This may not be so common a fault as some of the others mentioned, but it is common enough to deserve notice. Moreover, there is reason to fear that it may become more common. The coarse and vulgar familiarity indulged in by certain popular evangelists in their prayers is likely to capture the interest and imagination of a certain class of preachers and to tempt them to imitate it. Everything of this kind is most offensive to propriety and to good taste. We ought not to speak to God in the slang of the street, nor in the lingo of the ball-field or the race-course. We should not even

<sup>13</sup> Extempore Prayer, page 147.

use the unconventional familiarity which may mark our intercourse with our intimate friends. It is true that God is our Father, but we should never forget that He is our heavenly Father, and that He is also our moral Governor, and our righteous Judge, and the Lord God Almighty. We should use the language of the common people in prayer, but not the colloquialisms and ungrammatical expressions which too often disfigure it.

9. *Undue violence of speech.* Some ministers seem to interpret too literally the words of Jesus, "The kingdom of heaven suffereth violence, and the violent taketh it by force." They storm and bluster as if they thought that God was deaf, or that He could be frightened into hearing and answering their prayers. Prayer should be earnest, as a matter of course. We should not pray as though we did not care whether we are heard or not. But earnestness does not require loudness or ranting. The words of Spurgeon apply well to this fault and also to that of over-familiarity. "Familiarity there may be, but holy familiarity; boldness, but the boldness which springs from grace and is the work of the Spirit; not the boldness of the rebel who carries a brazen front in the presence of his offended king, but the boldness of the child who fears because he loves, and loves because he fears. Never fall into a vainglorious style of impertinent address to God; He is not to be assailed as an antagonist, but entertained with as our Lord and God. Humble and lowly let us be in spirit, and so let us pray."<sup>14</sup>

10. *Exhortation.* Prayers are to be addressed to God, not to the congregation. To turn aside from speaking to God, to warn sinners of their danger or to plead with them to repent and be saved, or to exhort Christians to their duty, is not only in bad taste, it approaches the sacrilegious. No minister should ever be guilty of such a thing. He should preach to the people when he preaches, and pray to God when he prays, and never confuse the two or mix them up so that his hearers can not tell whether he is preaching or praying.

Even worse, if anything, is praying *at* people instead

<sup>14</sup> Lectures to My Students, page 58.

of praying *for* them, the attempt to refute error, or to expose wrong, or to rebuke sin, under the guise of prayer. Spurgeon tells of an old time Methodist minister who was asked to offer prayer after a young Calvinist had violently attacked Arminianism in his sermon. The good Methodist prayed, among other things, that the Lord would bless the young man who had just preached so that "his heart might become as soft as his head." Spurgeon adds, "Most probably the young orator deserved a castigation for his offense of charity, but the older one sinned ten times more in his want of reverence."

11. *Paying compliments in prayer.* Ministers have been known to ask God to bless "this large and intelligent audience." The congregation may be both large and intelligent. They may have many other good qualities, and they may have done many good works. But they should never to be told of these things under the guise of praying to God, and God does not need to get the information in this way either. The same thing may be said of prayers in which God is thanked for "the most learned and eloquent sermon just preached by our dear brother," or for "the long and faithful services of our beloved brother" &c. Everything of this kind is in bad taste. The language of prayer should be simple, straightforward, earnest, direct, reverent, such as becomes a mortal man in speaking to the great God who made heaven and earth, and who is also our Creator, and Preserver, and Redeemer, and our bountiful Benefactor.

*Gettysburg, Pa.*



## ARTICLE IV.

## AMERICAN DEFECTS OF SENTIMENT.

BY T. B. STORK, ESQ.

It was Herbert Spencer, I believe, that prophesied the ruin of American institutions through sentimentality, which meant, of course, a defect of true sentiment. For public sentiment of some sort manifesting itself as public opinion is an essential of all societies that are not merely tyrannies. By it, society moves and has its being; without it, all vitality goes from the body politic. It is this public sentiment that enforces law, prescribes conduct, furnishes ideals, and is the life blood of intelligent, self-governing communities like those of England and the United States.

A study of the public sentiment of a country is therefore one of the most important, and, it must be added, one of the most difficult and delicate undertakings that can be attempted, for it requires an attention, in the first place, to what appear trifles, incidents, events, casual expressions caught up here and there, the flotsam and jetsam of daily life, that seem of no value or significance, but which, gathered together and critically examined, yield to the careful student valuable knowledge of the real spirit and life of the people. It is a study of minutiae, yet at the same time, it requires to be both broad and comprehensive, embracing every feature of national and social life, having regard to the smallest incidents, yet careful not to emphasize unduly any particular one; to gather all the trivial and minute details of daily life, with due regard to each, but without unduly magnifying any one; to seize through them the true public sentiment which runs through them, informs and animates them in large and public matters, as well as in the more private affairs of each man's daily life. This is no easy task, yet the value of any true generalization that may possibly result, even if imperfect, makes it well worth the trying.

To the student of American public sentiment there appear, upon the most casual examination, two prominent and apparently contradictory characteristics. There are, first: in many instances a disregard of the rights, privileges and dignity of the individual as a human unit; a person separate and independent of the crowd, with private rights and individuality to be respected, and second: a very strong feeling and sympathy for that same human unit under circumstances of misfortune. There is a universal solicitude and an almost morbid sympathy for the suffering, the oppressed, the down-and-out class, to use a familiar phrase of the street. With this goes a generous impulse to help all such, that is unequalled in any other civilized nation.

If we refresh these abstractions with a few illustrative instances of conduct, perhaps we shall better understand their meaning. We take for our first instance, two almost parallel occurrences, one in England, the other in the United States, so that by way of contrast we may appreciate the illustrative value of each. Some years ago, in one of our eastern cities, a gentleman was standing in a long line waiting his turn at the paying teller's window in a bank. A dispute arose between himself and another gentleman regarding their respective rights to precedence. Finally one of them flew into a violent passion and struck the other a powerful blow which broke his nose and disfigured him in a way which not only inflicted a gross indignity in a public place, but caused such physical suffering that the services of a physician were required. This assault, growing out of a simple dispute as to rights of precedence, and to which no resistance was offered by the man attacked, would justly call for the infliction of a prison term, any impartial reader would suppose, and the imposing of such a sentence by a court of justice as would fix upon the wrong doer the moral stigma of his wrong-doing and teach, as only violent men can be taught, that law is not to be lightly broken and the person of peaceable citizens is sacred from physical violence. But no; instead of prompt and exemplary punishment, a vigorous vindication of the law, this gross offender

against it was, after the expiration of several years, lightly admonished by a small fine, and to all appearances public sentiment was content, and even the injured man himself gave no sign of dissatisfaction.

About the same time in England a gentleman hurrying into a railway carriage, accidentally struck, with a hand-bag, the knee of a second gentleman who had already taken his seat. An apology was demanded for the involuntary trespass, which the first gentleman refused with the true British sense of justice, remarking that an unintentional act of that sort required no apology; whereupon, our second gentleman, asserting with an air of superiority his relationship to an earl, struck the face of the obstinate one, by way of teaching him better manners, let us suppose. This method of instruction, however, did not favorably impress the latter who promptly summoned his aggressor, and the police magistrate, with equal promptness, sentenced him to a number of months in jail, remarking with terse wisdom, that such an offense called not for a fine, but a prison term. The English offender suffered punishment almost immediately, while the American was not fined for a number of years. Here we have sharply defined the difference between English and American justice; that is English and American public sentiment regarding personal rights, the sacredness of the individual and his right to be unmolested and to a speedy and effectual remedy for any violation of the same; for the administration of the criminal law, especially is precisely the expression in a formal way of that public sentiment which governs conduct and prescribes what is and what is not approved, not only in the larger affairs of life that touch crimes and misdemeanors, but those smaller ones that only affect etiquette and manners. For after all, does not that public sentiment, which governs conduct, include all behavior to others, whether it be that grave obligation, thou shalt not kill, or that small courtesy, thou shalt not speak rudely; and who will say that the unconventionality of the American, his disregard of small rights and courtesies, is not part and parcel of the general want of appreciation of the rights and dignity

of each man as a private individual. And is not this independence of rule, the direct result of this lax sense of personal rights and dignity? It is a result, not of the Democratic doctrine that everybody is as good as anybody, but of that other doctrine, everybody is better than anybody, which means that I must guard my own right but may trespass on my neighbors as much as I please or his good nature will suffer. I do not expect the courts to protect me but I will protect myself. This is the logical result of the lax sense of personal rights and the duty of protecting them seen in our courts and exemplifying this public sentiment; the two react on each other; the lax sense of right recognized by the courts goes far to encourage that lax public sentiment of which it is in turn the creature, and one cannot altogether blame the offended individual who has had his nose broken, and after a number of years receives amends by way of a trifling fine, if he says: "Next time I will execute my own justice; I will shoot the man who assaults me. If the court refuses to protect me, I will protect myself."

That this is the way the matter works out in practice can be seen by any one who reads the daily news with ordinary intelligence. I pick up the morning paper and there I read (not an unusual incident by the way) of the murder of one Antonio Cincotta, a man who had been convicted of blackmailing the singer Caruso. The same Cincotta had been, nearly twenty years before, arrested on a charge of homicide, but was discharged; within six months he was again arrested on a charge of felonious assault and discharged; he was again arrested and tried for homicide, but was acquitted; later he was convicted on a charge of attempted extortion, but again the appellate court rescued him from what one cannot but think knowing his previous conduct, was a just punishment. And so legal justice in the courts apparently failing, the man is assassinated in the open street and private vengeance substitutes itself for the legal and orderly punishment of the criminal, a task for which, for some reason, the courts of law seemed inadequate.

It might well be expected that if public sentiment did not regard this substantial right of the individual to

freedom from personal violence and insult, still less would it care for those unsubstantial rights which affect his feelings, his reputation, his sense of personal self-respect and worthy pride. And this expectation is not disappointed for if we turn to the law of libel and its enforcement by our courts, we shall find little respect for the reputation of men. Juries are inclined to laugh at the nice sense of personal dignity and self-respect that resents being called a thief and a liar, makes a serious question of such trifles and asks a substantial sum by way of reparation. Their feeling, which truly represents the feeling of the community at large (the jury in legal parlance is the country) might be expressed to the complaining suitor, using the picturesque slang of the day, in this wise: "Go to, mister sensitive man, what is the matter with you: forget it!"

It seems Democratic to despise these little personal prides of character and to consider people who value their reputation as holding themselves better than their fellows, a kind of remnant of mediaeval Sixteenth Century chivalry and knight errantry.

In like manner, we have even a President of the United States who does not hesitate to stigmatize other public men as liars, to which they reply in like manner. Neither party has a feeling of personal injury, apparently, but each allows the matter "to go at that," as the common phrase has it. In some societies such an exchange of epithets could only be atoned for by bloodshed, and the duel may have done much, bad as it was, to sustain that sentiment so vital to the interests of society, of respect for ones self and to teach a nice regard for the self-respect of others.

And so, as might be inferred, the law of libel and its enforcement by our courts, is almost non-existent. The late case of the expulsion from the Senate of the United States of Senator Lorimer is still fresh enough in our memories. In that case one unfortunate witness testified against the Senator and was, as a punishment, made the victim of a blackmailing scheme designed to destroy his character. The conspiracy was composed of a law-

yer, a woman, of course, and some others. The lawyer was convicted of an attempt to ruin this innocent man's reputation. At great expense and the cost of much personal suffering, the intended victim saved himself and his family from these people, whom it is no exaggeration to call, in the words of Scripture, desperately wicked. The chief criminal, the lawyer, for this flagrant attempt to blacken an innocent man who had done nothing but offend by his testimony a corrupt politician, an attempt that involved perjury, subordination of perjury, and other crimes, was sentenced to pay a fine of \$2,000. Imagine what a sentence to penal servitude such a conviction would have called forth in an English court of justice; and deservedly, for what should be more sacred than a man's good name; sacred for his own sake, sacred for the good of the whole community, since its own ultimate safety must largely rest upon the one sure foundation of the truthfulness and probity and self-respect of its citizens; once destroy that and society is at an end.

For so grave a crime, \$2,000 fine was virtually no punishment and to the vast financial interests involved it meant nothing but a free permit to attack the character of any man who was obnoxious to them, at the risk, if unsuccessful, of paying what to such interests and for their purposes, was a mere nothing.

It is no exaggeration to characterize public sentiment that permits such things as gravely lacking in certain elements essential to a safe, sound, and wholesome social life. How can self-respect and dignity of character be maintained where courts of justice so lightly regard offenses against them? It may easily be inferred that men who have no respect for others would soon cease to properly respect themselves and such is found to be the case. The behavior and language of men in public life show how general is the prevalence of this grave defect in American sentiment. The newspapers relish, and the public consider smart and witty, conduct which, if it occurred in the English Parliament, or on any English public occasion, would be summarily and unhesitatingly condemned, and there would be fixed upon the man guilty of

it a certain social stigma, more effectual than the judgment of any court. Only the other day the President of a great railroad was called before a public official body to explain the ruin of his road, a ruin that had beggared many innocent, helpless, people, and plunged an important section of the country into financial difficulty. No one with proper self-respect could witness the flippant attitude of this man when dealing with so grave a task without a keen sense of shame that any one holding so responsible a position should have no appreciation of the befitting; no sense of public dignity or private self-respect. In the halls of Congress we behold not infrequent exhibitions of the same defect, that lack of respect for others and for one's self which forbids flippancy and frivolity of speech in grave matters. Not long ago a lot of silly, doggerel verse was recited by one member in reply to the remarks of another; afterwards, on motion, the verses were directed to be omitted from the record. Fancy Bonar Law or Sir John Carson even descending to such a disregard of the dignity of the House of Commons. Trifles these, you may say, yet indications of national character, just as a ragged collar, a missing button, a not too immaculate linen tells us of private individual character; the man who disregarded either in his dealings with the world would miss valuable insights.

Naturally enough, we find the newspapers, those mirrors of public sentiment, show a like disregard, a want of that reticence which ought to be maintained, if the self-respect and dignity of the individual is to be preserved. Personal gossip, individual peculiarities, intimate family occurrences, are all paraded in the public press with reckless particularity. That this is done without offense, or even with the active connivance of the people concerned only emphasizes its significance. It has even been hinted that many furnish the particulars themselves for the joy of seeing themselves in print. I take at random one specimen, accompanied by a portrait nearly one-fourth of the size of the paper, of an individual, a girl, of no public importance, not even a criminal, simply an obscure private person, whose marriage and dress, and



even her gifts to her bridesmaids, are all set forth at large.

Enough of this, the dark side. There is another, a bright side, to American public sentiment. With all this ignoring of individual rights, dignity, self-respect and privacy, we become aware of another set of phenomena which seem to go to the very opposite extreme, in which the highest consideration for the individual is shown; his needs, his tastes, his sufferings, are treated with a sympathy and attention equalled nowhere else in the world. In no other country of the world does the popular hero flourish for his brief moment with greater pomp and circumstance of adulation. Even criminals, who appeal to the popular imagination, are gently conveyed to the penitentiary amid cheering friends and surrounded with flowers. A New Jersey politician, convicted of bribery, was recently sent off to well-deserved punishment amid the cheers and sympathy of hosts of friends, who escorted him like some conquering hero to his train. The unfortunate man, whether criminal or simply unlucky, receives a consideration and a sympathy that seems almost unwholesome in its emotional intensity. What is true of the individual sufferer is equally true of the community, or nation that needs help. Starving Russia or Ireland, oppressed Cuba, chaotic Mexico, earthquake-shaken Sicily, war-stricken Europe; there is none that lacks that all-enveloping sympathy which America, by its public sentiment, gives more freely and generously than any other nation.

What then is the explanation of this curious paradox of a public sentiment which seems often to disregard the rights, dignity and privacy of the individual, and yet at the same time cherishes that individual when unfortunate with the tenderness and sympathy that is unequalled elsewhere. The answer is really not far to seek. American sentiment is the sentiment of the average man; it is the rights of the average man that are protected; it is his feelings that are respected; it is the average American, the American who elects our Presidents, our Governors, our Judges, who, by his great majority, rules the coun-

try. He is a rough, good natured, highly intelligent, commonplace individual; he has no use for what George Meredith calls the "nice shades and fine feelings"; they are nonsense to him; he has no understanding of the sensitive man who wishes to withdraw from the crowd, to live his own life apart from others and out of the lime-light of publicity. The average man is sociable and good hearted, loves his fellows and loves to hob nob with them; he likes public places, gregarious hotels, crowded resorts; the life of the poet, the thinker, the philosopher, the individual by and for himself, makes no appeal to him; perhaps that is why there are so few. He dislikes the eccentric, the individual, the different; he loves the common, the usual, the uniform; he respects the majority. His motto is "Everybody is wiser than anybody," no matter whether that anybody be a Bacon, a Newton or a Shakespeare. Public sentiment is his creation; it fosters his ideals and reflects his feelings. Physical suffering, hard knocks by fortune, these are ills he himself knows and so he is ready always with sympathy for them and help; pride of name, respect for reputation, the rights of privacy, of being and acting as each man prefers, regardless of the opinion of the majority, these are foolish fancies unworthy of the sensible man's regard.

The American, for these reasons, is what is called a good mixer; that is, he is not reserved or stand-offish, but meets every one on equal terms and feels at home with everybody, making everybody at home with him. For the same reason he justifies that very clever remark of one of his foreign critics that the American has not good or bad manners, but simply no manners at all; for manners might be called the *petits droits de societe*; they are the creatures of a sense of propriety, of what is due by and to each member of society to and from every other. This man goes in first to dinner; that man is entitled to the prefix Honorable; this man may keep his hat on in the presence of his sovereign; this man may address him first, and so on through the catalog of ridiculous privileges, shadowy distinctions, which none the less make

manners, and the want of which in America may well account for the absence of them.

English public sentiment is very different and by its difference sheds a strong and instructive light upon the American variety. For in England, as perhaps in no country in the world, individual rights, the dignity, the privacy, even the eccentricity of the individual are protected to the fullest extent. We all know that English self-assertive spirit which leads an Englishman to spend hundreds of pounds rather than submit to be imposed upon to the extent of a single shilling. In a similar case, the American says, with apparent hard common sense: "Oh let the shilling go; why bother about it." He forgets that the Englishman by his apparently foolish insistence upon his rights at any cost has done a great public service; has done something to create a public sentiment, which will, for the future, forbid any further shilling impositions anywhere.

At the first superficial glance it may seem odd that in England, a monarchy and an aristocracy, the individual should be protected in his rights so much more completely than in Democratic America, where every man, no matter how humble, is assumed to be as good as any other, and to be of greater importance merely as a man, than anywhere else in the world. But the explanation is sufficiently obvious; the public sentiment of a nation comes from its influential class, from the governing class, that is. Now, in England this governing class has been for centuries an Aristocratic Oligarchy, varying, it is true, as different groups attained power, but always the same in this, that it was Aristocratic in feeling and as such emphasized the individual and his rights as they were known to the Aristocrat. It was the Aristocrat's rights, not the average man's rights, that gave the note to its public sentiment. Its law givers, judges, all the officials of its government, were drawn from this class and in their conduct of affairs expressed the feelings and ideas of their class. Their feelings are picturesquely summed up in the familiar expression, "The Englishman's house is his castle" and we see them made plain to the most

careless eye in those great excluding walls that shut in the splendid parks and lovely gardens of English nobles and gentles from the vulgar passer-by on the dusty highway.

We can observe it too in the manners of the race, the reserve, the withdrawal into himself of the well bred Englishman, and also in the quiet respectful manners of the lower classes; for the overwhelming influence of the ruling class makes itself felt in the remotest corner of the social structure, enforcing its views of the correct convention for gentles and simples forming a body of public sentiment that prescribes to the gentles their characteristic reserve, that North American Indian *nil admirari* manner and inculcating in the simple a pride of its own peculiar manufacture which gives a dignity of their own to the waiter, the porter, the cabby, the policeman, the soldier and all the rest of their class. This dignity consists in the consciousness that they are too, each in his proper place, a part of a great proud society, that they share its self-respect, its glory, its fine public sentiment, which makes each proud of his position, whatever it is, and jealous of his rights and privileges in it. This gives a solidarity to the whole society, makes the average Englishman in his social relations love a Lord as part of his own dignity and as giving splendor to the society of which he feels himself a part, and in war makes of him an ideal soldier who looks up to his officers as to his natural leaders, for until recently it was the English nobleman and gentleman who officered and led the English army.

This public sentiment we have very vaguely outlined is the vital power which inspires the laws, manners, and national character of England and must be studied as a whole.

It might perhaps be said that we too have an upper class, a superior society, which may be thought to have an influence similar to that of the English aristocracy, a society that would foster individual dignity and that sense of personal right, but to this it must be observed that in the first place, our upper class has no voice as

such in the government; it furnishes no officials, above all, no judges, who are especially appointed to deal with such matters. It is the average man who does all this. And then, again, our upper class has no traditions, no background, no centuries of training. It is itself too recently sprung from the average man to have formed itself or its manners into a cult; it is itself only the average man plus a certain sum of money; a superior class whose superiority consists only in this can have no particular character of its own. It cannot therefore impress itself on the whole society. It can never attain to that proud sense of proprietorship in its place and dignity which leads an English aristocrat to resent the intrusion of a man of the middle class into the government, so that when that great English statesman, John Bright, one of the greatest probably in breadth of view and far-reaching vision which England produced in the last century, presumed to state his views on the Crimean War, he was taunted by Lord Palmerston as the *Rev. Mr. Bright*, who by that term sought at once to mark his scorn of his peaceful views and his contempt for his middle class origin. It was of this same oligarchy that Cobden wrote to Charles Sumner in 1862 apropos of some reform measure "but we have a battle to fight with our own feudal governing class."

*Philadelphia, Pa.*

## ARTICLE V.

CHRIST'S AUTHORITY THROUGHOUT THE NEW  
TESTAMENT.

BY PROFESSOR LEANDER S. KEYSER, D.D.

Very often to-day we hear the cry, "Back to Christ." When by this demand is meant that we should go back to the spirit and teaching of Christ and His inspired apostles in the entire New Testament, so that we may imbibe and practice them more and more, all of us will gladly assent. Every true reformation in the history of the Christian Church has been achieved by going back to the pure teachings of the New Testament.

However, the phrase, "Back to Christ," as it is currently used by a certain class of theologians, is not employed in the above sense. By some it means a disparagement, if not a positive rejection, of all the creeds of the Church, not excepting those that are called ecumenical. It is not our purpose in this article to deal with this specious use of the expression; therefore we shall stop merely to say that the theologian who ignores all the Christian thinking of the past, and especially that which has been crystalized in the great confessions of the Church at the most strategic epochs in the history of the Christian faith, surely does not prove himself a well-balanced and judicial thinker, but rather one who is surfeited with the sense of his own importance and ability; one who "thinks more highly of himself than he ought to think." As well might the botanist or geologist of to-day declare that he would go to the plants and rocks for himself, and would disregard all that previous thinkers and investigators had accomplished in those special sciences. While we cannot stop to dilate on this attitude of mind toward the past, yet we must add that, if you will follow the statements of the liberalist of the foregoing type, you will find, as a rule, that he has not deeply and thoroughly studied the theology of the creeds he belittles and com-

pared them diligently with the teachings of Scripture. Moreover, you will almost always discover ere long that he cherishes lax views of the inspiration of the Bible.

A second class of writers—and with these we shall deal in this paper—whose slogan is, "Back to Christ," mean to set Christ's teachings as found in the gospels, especially the synoptics, in opposition to the teachings of His apostles in the Acts and the Epistles. That is, they mean, "Let us get back to Christ from Paul and the rest of the apostles." These men tell us that all that comes after the gospels is the result of reflection and speculation after Christ's resurrection and ascension. Therefore much of it is merely human; it belongs to a theologizing period; it cannot therefore be placed on a par with the simple teaching of Jesus in the gospels, particularly the synoptics. Several members of the faculty of the Divinity School of the University of Chicago have been protagonists of this view; so much so, indeed, that Dr. William Cleaver Wilkinson has come out in a pungent and incisive book against them—a book that, barring a little too much rhetoric, is to be commended as a most crushing argument against the specious position taken by the liberalists. The title of his book is, "Paul and the Revolt Against Him." We shall not follow Dr. Wilkinson in his masterly arguments, but shall look at the question as it appears to us.

Our main proposition is that Christ's teachings were not completed in the gospels, but that He purposely left many things of vital importance to be revealed by Him through the Holy Spirit to His apostles, whom He inspired and equipped for this very purpose; and therefore the teachings in the Acts, the Epistles and the Revelation are just as much His own teachings and just as authoritative as are the teachings recorded in the gospels. Let us see whether this is not the clear doctrine taught in the New Testament. First, what do the synoptics themselves teach, or, rather, what does Jesus teach in them? In Matt. 28:18-20 we read: "And Jesus came unto them and spake unto them, saying, All authority hath been given unto me in heaven and on earth. Go ye, *therefore*,



and make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I commanded you: and, lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world." What is the plain doctrine of this great commission? Note the logical force of the "therefore" which we have italicised. Because Christ had received all authority, *therefore* He commissioned His apostles go forth and teach His doctrines. And if they actually taught by His authority, as He bade them, would not their teaching be *His* teaching, and would it not be just as authoritative as that which fell from His lips during His humiliation? And what does He command them to teach? Their own speculations? No, indeed! but "all things whatsoever I have commanded you." Then He graciously promises that He will be with them alway. And why? Surely for the purpose of inspiring them and making them strong and inerrant in their proclamation. Now if the apostles obeyed His commission, they must have taught nothing contrary to His instructions to them during His earthly ministry. And where do we have the record of what they did and taught under this divine influence? Only in the Acts, the Epistles, and the Revelation.

Our next citation is Mark. 16:15, 16: "And He said unto them, Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to the whole creation. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; he that disbelieveth shall be condemned." Here again Jesus indicates that the preaching of the apostles was to be authoritative, even on a par with His own preaching, for the salvation of those who heard the message was conditioned on their acceptance of it. Christ never made a stronger claim than that for His own personal teaching during His earthly ministry. This contention is further emphasized by the concluding verses of the same gospel: "So then the Lord Jesus, after He had spoken unto them, was received up into heaven, and sat down at the right hand of God. And they went forth and preached everywhere, the Lord working with them, and confirming the word by the

signs that followed. Amen." Does not that statement make the preaching of the apostles the authorized preaching of the Lord Jesus Himself?

The following is Luke's statement of the last commission (24:44-48): "And He said unto them, These are my words which I spake unto you, while I was yet with you, that all things must needs be fulfilled, which are written in the law of Moses, and the prophets, and the Psalms concerning me. Then opened He their mind that they might understand the Scriptures. . . . Ye are witnesses of these things. And behold, I send forth the promise of my Father upon you: but tarry ye in the city until ye be clothed with power from on high." Here even the authority of the Father is added to that of Christ, enduing the apostles. This promise was made good on the day of Pentecost.

Next note the teaching of Christ in the gospel according to St. John; it will be seen to be quite as relevant. How significant are all Christ's promises of the Holy Spirit to His apostles! And He promised not only the Spirit, but also His own presence and that of the Father. John 14:15-18: "If ye love me, ye will keep my commandments. And I will pray the Father, and He shall give you another Comforter, that He may be with you forever, even the Spirit of truth; whom the world cannot receive, for it beholdeth Him not, neither knoweth Him; ye know Him, for He abideth with you and shall be in you. I will not leave you desolate; I will come to you." No less significant is John 14:25, 26: "These things have I spoken unto you while yet abiding with you; but the Comforter, even the Holy Spirit, whom the Father will send in my name, He shall teach you all things, and bring to your remembrance all that I said unto you." From this we may conclude that, if Christ afterward made good His promise, the Holy Spirit brought back to the memory of the apostles many of Christ's teachings that they would have otherwise forgotten. Would not this teaching, thus inerrantly recalled to their remembrance by the Holy Spirit, be in deed and in truth the real teaching of Christ Himself, the very doctrine that fell from His own

lips? In John 15:26 the Holy Spirit is again called the "Spirit of truth," and the statement is added that He will proceed "from the Father," and "He shall bear witness of me." The only question is, Are we willing to accept the subsequent witness of the Holy Ghost as true? Observe how often Jesus calls the Holy Ghost "the Spirit of truth."

A decisive passage for the evangelical believer is John 16:12-15: "I have many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now. Howbeit, when He, the Spirit of truth is come, He will guide you into all truth; for He shall not speak from Himself; but what things soever He shall hear, these shall He speak: and He shall declare unto you the things that are to come. He shall glorify me, for He shall take of mine and declare it unto you. All things whatsoever the Father hath are mine: therefore I said, He shall take of mine and declare it unto you." This sublime passage proves that Jesus purposely withheld certain truths from His apostles until they were endued and enlightened by the Holy Spirit so that they could bear them. Thus our Lord Himself teaches that He had no intention of completing His doctrines while He was here in His earthly state, but expressly left many things for subsequent revelation. Where do we have this supplemental teaching if not in writings of the apostles? If we do not have them there, we do not have them at all; and that would empty Christ's promise of all content and leave it unfulfilled. Therefore to discredit the doctrines of the apostles is to discredit Christ's own teaching and promise. How can the liberalists avoid the fatal conclusion?

John 17 ought to be read in full. It records our Redeemer's intercessory prayer for His apostles. Again and again He prays for them. Verse 15: "I pray not that thou shouldest take them from the world, but that thou shouldest keep them from the evil one." How vital are verses 17-21: "Sanctify them in thy truth; thy word is truth. As thou didst send me into the world, even so sent I them into the world. And for their sakes I sanctify myself, that they themselves also may be sanctified

in truth. Neither for these only do I pray, but for them also that believe on me through their word; that they may all be one; even as thou, Father, art in me and I in thee, that they also may be in us; that the world may believe that thou didst send me." If this does not mean a special endowment and inspiration of our Lord's apostles, the words are meaningless.

So much, then, for Christ's own teaching in the gospels. When and where did His gracious promises receive their fulfillment? We turn to the Acts of the Apostles, and find that, if we take the simple New Testament record just as it is, without prejudice or subjective theories, the whole teaching is beautifully consistent and self-interpreting. In Acts 1:1, 2 we read: "The former treatise I made, O Theophilus, concerning all that Jesus *began* both to *do* and to *teach*, until the day in which He was received up, after that He had given commandment through the Holy Spirit unto the apostles whom He had chosen." This agrees perfectly with John 16:12-15, where Jesus said, "I have many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now"; therefore Luke says that Jesus, during His earthly life, simply "began" to do and to teach—that is, He did not complete His work or His doctrine, but laid down only the fundamental principles, the essential germs of truth, and then inspired His holy apostles to conserve and develop them. Then in the subsequent verses (4, 5, 8) He bids them tarry at Jerusalem, promises them the baptism of the Holy Spirit, the endowment of power, and adds: "Ye shall be my witnesses both in Jerusalem, and in all Judea and Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth." Now the question is whether Jesus fulfilled His promise to be with them (Matt 28:20), and to guide them by His Spirit into all truth (John 16:13). The apostles returned to Jerusalem, and continued in prayer in the sacred "upper room." It being necessary to select an apostle to fill the place of Judas, the company prayed thus: "Thou, Lord, who knowest the hearts of all men, show of these two the one whom thou hast chosen," etc.; and in answer to their prayer, the lot fell upon Matthias. From this we see that

Jesus began at once to redeem His promise of divine guidance.

Acts 2 recites the wonderful event of Pentecost, when the promise of Christ was literally fulfilled—the Holy Spirit was given and the apostles were baptized with power. Now how does Peter, who was the chief spokesman on that occasion, account for the outpouring of the Holy Spirit? We find it in Acts 2:32, 33: "This Jesus did God raise up, whereof we are witnesses. Being therefore by the right hand of God exalted, and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Spirit, *He* hath poured forth *this* which ye see and hear." The antecedent of "He" is Christ, and therefore it was Christ Himself who poured out the Holy Spirit on that day. Would not the work of the glorified and exalted Christ, performed through the Holy Spirit, be just as authoritative as what He did and said during His kenosis and humiliation?

A careful reading of the book of Acts will convince any one that the apostles and their chosen helpers always spoke and acted as if they were in the presence of Christ and were guided by the Holy Spirit. For instance, Peter disclaimed having healed the lame man by his own power, but declared that the miracle had taken place through faith in the name of Jesus. When Stephen had concluded his wonderful address, he saw heaven opened and the Son of Man *standing* on the right hand of God—not sitting, for He was then in the attitude of one who had risen to help and welcome His faithful witness. Paul, as well as the rest of the apostles, claims the same enduement directly from the exalted Jesus.

In the opening verses of both of his epistles Peter calls himself "an apostle of Jesus Christ," and throughout he speaks in a tone of authority that betokens the consciousness of divine direction. In 2 Pet. 3:1, 2 he says: "This is now, beloved, the second epistle that I write unto you; and in both of them I stir up your sincere mind by putting you in remembrance; that ye should remember the words which were spoken before by the holy prophets, and the commandment of the Lord and Saviour through

your apostles"; a passage that invests the apostles with an authority equal to that of the prophets. The apostle John indicates that he writes by divine authority, or at least by positive and certain knowledge (see I John 1:1-5). In the Apocalypse he claims to have direct communion with the exalted Redeemer and to receive dictation from Him as to what he shall write to the seven churches.

It might almost be said that the apostle Paul is *persona non grata* to liberalizing theologians. They censure him for having theologized about Christ, for having developed a system of theology by means of his speculations. Thus they think he has confused the simplicity of Christ's teachings. He has added to it a well wrought-out theology of the person of Christ, of the vicarious atonement, of justification by faith alone, salvation by grace, the resurrection of the body, and a good many other doctrines. Such a determinate doctrinal system the liberalists do not like. A good many of these doctrines their rationalistic temper cannot abide. So they look back to the gospels, and do not find these doctrines so fully developed there; from which they leap to the conclusion that Paul was a speculative theologian, a dogmatist, who unfolded a system that finds no warrant in Christ's teaching. Little wonder that these men do not relish the Pauline theology. They have almost as little regard for him as they have for the definite theology of the Nicene and Athanasian Creeds.

But before we consent to have Paul discredited and cast overboard, we would better look into the status of his case. Of course, if we choose to throw away the evangelical records, or manipulate them according to preconceived notions, neither Paul nor Christ can say an authoritative word for us. However, it is not our purpose to go into the question of the criticism of the gospels and epistles, but simply to show what they teach regarding Paul's relation to Christ. There will be an advantage in this method, for if we can make our contention good, it will show that the quarrel of the liberalists is with the evangelical records, not with orthodox theologians.

The New Testament witness is clear that Paul received his commission as an apostle directly from the exalted Christ. Luke tells the story of Paul's conversion in Acts 9:1-19; Paul tells it himself in Acts 22:3-21, and again in Acts 26:9-23. He lays claim to the apostleship—Rom. 1:4, 5: "Even Jesus Christ, through whom we received grace and apostleship"; I Cor. 9:2: "If to others I am not an apostle, yet at least I am to you; for the seal of mine apostleship are ye in the Lord"; Gal. 2:8: "For He that wrought for Peter unto the apostleship of the circumcision wrought for me also unto the Gentiles." In almost, if not quite, all of his epistles he calls himself an apostle, e. g., Rom. 1:1, I Cor. 1:1, Gal. 1:1, and so on with the rest. He contends earnestly for his apostleship against all gainsayers. I Cor. 9:1: "Am I not free? am I not an apostle? have I not seen Jesus our Lord? are not ye my work in the Lord?" II Cor. 12:11, 12: "For in nothing was I behind the very chiefest apostles, though I am nothing. Truly the signs of an apostle were wrought among you in all patience, by signs and wonders and mighty works." Rom. 11:13: "Inasmuch then as I am an apostle of Gentiles, I glorify my ministry." He contends that he received his call from God (Gal. 1:15-17). It was God who had "separated him," even from his mother's womb, to "reveal His Son in" Him, that He might "preach Him among the Gentiles." Thus called, he says: "Straightway I conferred not with flesh and blood, neither went I up to Jerusalem to them that were apostles before me." He tells plainly his authority for the gospel (Gal. 1:11, 12): "For I make known to you, brethren, as touching the gospel which was preached by Me, that it is not after man. For neither did I receive it from man, nor was I taught it, but it came to me through revelation of Jesus Christ." He bears similar testimony in I Cor. 11:23: "For I received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you," etc. He asserts that he was "called to be an apostle of Jesus Christ through the will of God." He claims to have the Spirit of God (I Cor. 7:40). Even if an angel from heaven should come to preach another gospel, Paul pronounces



him anathema (Gal. 1:8). Another of his claims was that Christ lived in him (Gal. 2:20); also that the love of Christ constrained him (II Cor. 5:14).

Now the argument stands thus: Was Paul either an impostor or a fanatic? There is no internal nor external proof that he was either—none whatever; on the contrary, every circumstance proves that he was both sincere and well-balanced. Then he must have spoken the sober truth when he contended that he had received his call and commission directly from the glorified Christ, who met him on the way to Damascus, and ever afterward was present with him. Now, if he received his vocation to the apostleship from the glorified Christ, we beg to know why such a call would not be just as authoritative as it would have been had he received it from the Master in the days of His humiliation? And if Christ's promise that the Holy Spirit would lead His apostles into all needed truth was fulfilled by our Lord (and this promise surely would pertain to the greatest of all His apostles), we fail to see why the doctrines of Paul would not be the veritable doctrines of our divine Lord and Saviour. Does Christ have less authority in the glorified state than He had during the kenosis? In the days of His humiliation He did not set up the claim of having all authority in heaven and on earth; it was only after His resurrection and just before His ascension that He made this claim. Moreover, it is a strange mode of interpretation which attributes more authority to Christ's words while He was here on earth than to the inspiration of His Spirit after He had ascended to the right hand of Omnipotence. While Christ was here in the earthly state He did not confer great power on His apostles; indeed, they were a weak company of men; one of them denied Him; all of them forsook Him and fled; they could scarcely be convinced of His resurrection from the dead; they were full of doubts and fears. Only after they had seen Him alive a number of times, and had witnessed His ascension into the heavens, were their doubts allayed; only when the exalted Christ had poured His Spirit upon them, did the last vestige of doubt disappear; only

then were they clothed with a superhuman power that made them steadfast in all danger and trial. Thus endowed, they were able to do even greater works than their Lord had done in the days of His self-limitation. (John 14:12).

And, by the way, it will be worth while to pause a moment to examine the passage last cited, as it will support our present view. Here Jesus said: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, he that believeth in me, the works that I do shall he do also; and greater works than these shall he do." And why? "Because I go to the Father; and whatsoever ye shall ask in my name, that will I do, that the Father may be glorified in the Son." Note that the very reason assigned for the greater ability of believers is that Christ will ascend to the Father to be clothed with divine power, and thus enabled to do all that His disciples may ask in His name. Why then was not Paul's vocation as valid and authoritative as that of the rest of the apostles? Why, too, were not the post-ascension commissions and enduements of the whole apostolic college completely authoritative?

If it should be said that Paul never met Christ personally while He was here on earth, and never heard any of His instructions from His own lips, our reply is, If his own story of his conversion on the Damascus road is true, he met the ascended and glorified Christ, and received his apostolic authority from Him. This would more than compensate for his failing to know Christ "according to the flesh."

It should be remembered that some of Paul's letters were written before some of the gospels were composed. It is not likely that he had any of our present gospels before him when he wrote these letters. His sources of information relative to Christ must therefore have been just as reliable as those of Mark and Luke. It is strange, therefore, that some of the liberalists, who regard the gospels of Mark and Luke as authoritative for Christ's teaching, should in the same breath discredit Paul's teaching. What were Paul's sources? First, the Old Testament prophecies, to which he had the same access

as the evangelists; second, the reports of the immediate disciples of Christ; third, direct revelations from the exalted Messiah. All of these combined would make Paul an authority for Christ, just as much of an authority as the writers of the gospels, whether apostles or only disciples.

Let it be asked how it occurs that Paul carries the doctrines of salvation so much further than do the gospels; that he presents a fuller doctrine of grace, faith, justification, atonement, and of the divine-human person of our Lord Jesus Christ. In reply we would say, we have studied the writings of Paul for many years, and are convinced from the internal evidences that they are more than merely human compositions; that such depth and elevation of thought are beyond unaided human acumen; that, therefore, the only adequate explanation is that which Paul himself assigns, namely, that he received his vocation from God in Christ, and wrote under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit. Indeed, if we did not have the teachings of the apostles and the inspired history of their works after the ascension of Christ, we should have a very meager and indeterminate body of doctrines, and the way of salvation itself would be obscure. However, with the completed revelation, the way of life is made plain even for wayfaring men, and we also have a sufficiently full and definite body of doctrine to satisfy those who love scientific theology.

Truly enough, all the precious doctrines of our religion are found in seminal form in the gospels; but how nobly Jesus led His apostles by His inspiring Spirit to develop those doctrines! Take the doctrine of Christ's atoning sacrifice; if we did not have the inspired development by Paul and Peter and John (Rom. 3:25, 26, 1 Pet. 3:18, 1 John 2:1, 2), we should have a meager and unsatisfying idea of the meaning of Christ's passion and death. With the teaching of the whole Bible before us, however, we are able to formulate a doctrine of atonement that satisfies the heart, wins the affections, and fulfills all the ethical demands of the enlightened intellect and conscience. The same is true of Christology; the

synoptics set Christ forth as the Son of Man; John's gospel exhibits Him as the eternal Logos and the Son of God; while Paul, Peter and John, besides portraying Him in His humiliation, also depict him in his exaltation at the right hand of power and glory, where He is filled with all the fullness of God. How meager would be our doctrine of Pneumatology if the Acts and the Epistles had never been written! Without Paul our conceptions of grace and faith would be so defective that we doubt whether the doctrine of salvation would have endured throughout the centuries. Christ taught a very meager Ecclesiology; only twice in the gospels does He mention the Church (Matt. 16:18 and 18:17). Can any one believe that this is all he ever meant to teach respecting that divinely instituted organization of which He Himself declares that "the gates of hell shall not prevail against it?" And where do we find the doctrine and mission of the Church developed and clearly set forth? In the Acts, the Epistles and the Revelation. As to the last things—Eschatology—we need all the invigorating teaching of Paul, Peter and John in their epistles and the Revelation, to make the future life sufficiently attractive to be a real incentive for following Christ in times of great tribulation.

While we desire to be generous, yet the truth compels us to say that, whenever you find a theologian who repudiates the development of doctrine by Paul, Peter and John and the history of the Church recited by Luke in the Acts, all you need to do is to push him to define his doctrinal system, and you will find that it is very misty and indeterminate; that he does not accept the orthodox and confessional doctrines of the Trinity, the person of Christ, the substitutional atonement, justification by faith alone and salvation *sola gratia*; while on the doctrine of Biblical inspiration he is likely to be far off to one side. Many of the liberalistic theologians do not accept even the synoptic gospels in their entirety, but slice away such portions as do not comport with their critical theories and doctrinal preconceptions.

Another matter is worthy of comment. Some investi-

gators make a mistake, we think, in their efforts to work out a complete system of Christian doctrine and ethics from the gospels alone. If Jesus had meant to complete His system of redemptive truth during His earthly life, such efforts might succeed; but we know from His own express statements that He simply aimed to lay the foundation in teaching, example and atonement, and then, after His ascension and glorification, endued His apostles with the Holy Spirit, who should direct them in erecting the superstructure of truth and salvation. This is evident from His last commissions, from His promise of the Spirit who would lead His apostles into all truth and endue them with power, from the actual history of the Church after our Lord's ascension, and from the many truths added to the gospels by the apostles themselves under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit. Therefore it is narrow and one-sided to try to work out a complete theology and ethic from the gospels alone. It is not fair to Christ Himself who told His apostles expressly that the Holy Spirit would lead them into further truth. An excellent writer (evangelical, too, as far as we can judge) has, we think, made this mistake in a recent book dealing with the ethics and social teaching of Christ. By a somewhat labored effort he seems to make out his case—that is, he proves that the teachings of Christ in the gospels are the real solvent of all ethical and social problems. However, how much easier would have been his task, and how much clearer a light he might have thrown upon life's problems, if he had used the whole New Testament! Let us illustrate our viewpoint. If you were to consider Christ's teaching in the gospels alone as to the treatment of the poor, there would be danger of pauperizing many people, and encouraging in them a spirit of dependence; but co-ordinate it with Paul's teaching (which is also Christ's teaching, for Paul was inspired), and you will see how every danger is avoided: "If any man will not work, neither shall he eat." (II Thess. 3:10); "For each man shall bear his own burden" (Gal. 6:5). Again, observe how Paul completes and balances the teachings of the gospels regarding the relations of mas-

ters and servants, husbands and wives, parents and children. Yes, we need the whole New Testament—the whole Bible, indeed—to give us a complete and satisfying conception of doctrine, ethics and practical Christian living.

In the interests of evangelical truth, it is time to call a halt to the liberalistic effort to "rob Paul to pay Christ," as some one has tersely put it; for Paul, having received his commission from the exalted Christ and being indued with His Spirit, was in every way just as competent to represent His Lord truly and fully as were Mark and Luke and even Matthew and John. If we are to know the whole teaching of Jesus, we must study the whole New Testament; yes, and the Old Testament as well; for Christ was the inspiring personality even in the preparatory dispensation; such is the declaration of an inspired apostle (I Pet. 1:10, 11): "Concerning which salvation the prophets sought and searched diligently, who prophesied of the grace which should come unto you; searching what time or what manner of time *the Spirit of Christ which was in them* did point unto, when it testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ, and the glories which should follow them." Thus the whole Bible is an organism, a divine unity; all inspired by the same Spirit of our Lord and Redeemer; and in order to formulate a complete and satisfying theology, a complete and satisfying system of ethics, a complete and satisfying scheme of redeeming grace through Christ, we must accept the hallowed teaching of the whole sacred Volume.

*Springfield, Ohio.*

## ARTICLE VI.

LUTHERAN EDUCATION.<sup>1</sup>

BY PROFESSOR L. H. LARIMER, D.D.

Prof. James Denny in an article in the *Constructive Quarterly* makes the following assertion, "The one great task which in the Protestant world is conspicuously neglected, and that, too, with the most deplorable results, is the task of Christian education. In modern communities, education is the business of the State, but State education is inevitably determined by State ends. It neither is, nor can be, nor ever will be, Christian education, and the passive surrender of education by the Church is simply suicidal. Faith has to be naturalized, not indeed in the world which is impossible, but in the Christian home and in the Christian Church, and that to educate its children into the freedom and fullness of the faith is the inalienable duty of the Church itself."

If this word of Prof. Denny is in any measure correct, it should call for earnest inquiry from every Protestant body, as to the causes of such regrettable conditions, and how they may be corrected. Our purpose is to inquire into the problem of education in the Lutheran Church. Other church bodies will have to solve their problems in their own way. While there may be a common condition among the different Protestant bodies, we believe that in some important particulars the Lutheran Church of this country has left less undone than some of the other denominations. There are few Lutheran pastorates in which there is not a faithful adherence to the doctrines and practices of our Church, as to the Baptism of the children, their instruction by means of the Catechism, and their subsequent confirmation. This training has been a great preservative in our Church, and where it is pursued faithfully and wisely by pastors, and co-operat-

<sup>1</sup> An address delivered at Convention of General Synod. Akron, Ohio, June 1, 1915.



ed in heartily by parents, it can bring only rich results. This is an essential part of our Lutheran education. Theoretically at least it is the minimum required of the young growing up in our Church. There are difficulties in this field of work, as in any other field. But at no time has there been a greater realization of the necessity, and the feasibility of this kind of training. Those who will read the literature of our Church on catechization will be impressed with the intelligence and the spiritual fervor which is brought forward to aid in solving the difficulties in the way. We need not pause to call attention to the catechetical system of our Church as being rightly based, religiously, psychologically, and pedagogically. No system will work of itself, and the success of catechization will depend largely on the catechist. The pastor should be a trained teacher, informed in the science of pedagogy, psychology, child-study, as well as in the subject matter which he is to teach. A thorough realization of the Church on this matter is always necessary. There is no greater need in the Church now than a sufficient number of trained pastors and teachers to see that not one child escapes the attention and the fostering care of the Church.

Our first word on Lutheran education is catechization—the instruction of the child in the Bible and in the doctrines of our Church by trained teachers from early childhood till the end of the school period. Toward this ideal the Church should diligently aim.

Here is the foundation of a good Lutheran education. Without it we can not expect the highest type of Lutheran manhood and womanhood. Too great care and zeal can not be exercised in this foundation work. Any comprehensive plan of Lutheran education must make the most diligent inquiry into the efficacy of our catechetical practices and principles. Any mistake or neglect that we permit in the catechetical stage will weaken the Church in later years. In our insistence upon this foundation work we are not forgetful of the spiritual factors to be employed and to be depended upon. This primary period of education according to our Church be-

gins with Baptism in and through which by virtue of the word of God the spiritual birth is given. This new life of the Spirit and of the Word of God is to be preserved and developed by the same divine agencies.

#### LUTHERAN ATMOSPHERE IN OUR HIGHER SCHOOLS OF LEARNING.

Education is not primarily a process of study and recitation—but it is the breathing of a pure and constantly clarifying atmosphere of knowledge and truth. The eye may be clear and good, capable of looking out over the plain and unto the mountains, and capable of looking up to the stars, but if the atmosphere is hazy the eye can not see far.

What are some of the conditions necessary for a proper Lutheran atmosphere in our higher schools of learning?

##### 1. *The Teaching Force.*

The teaching force in a Lutheran institution should be composed of men and women who have an intelligent enthusiasm and passion for the Lutheran Church. Apart from their preparation for the special department of study which they are to occupy, which preparation should be of the highest order, there should be required also a fine clear sense, a good knowledge and understanding of the Lutheran Church—her history, her faith, her responsibility, her resources, her outlook. The teacher in a Lutheran institution should be able to take his place in scholastic attainment, by the side of the teacher of any other institution, State or ecclesiastical. The Church should furnish and support a trained teaching force of the highest scholarly proficiency. In an age which subjects every teacher to scientific tests, the Lutheran teacher should fall behind in no particular. But this alone is not sufficient to make a good teacher in a Lutheran school. The properly equipped teacher must have knowledge, insight, enthusiasm for the Lutheran Church. There need be no conflict between Lutheranism and true scientific methods of study. The Lutheran Church has no creed formulas which will require any

one to close his eyes to proven truth. The Lutheran teacher is untrammelled by his Church. She wants him to have freedom of inquiry, and his field of study is as wide as the universe. But his study must not be a one-sided science. True science is like the golden city with its twelve gates of twelve pearls—its length, and breadth, and height are equal. Scientific pursuit has for its realm secondary causes and to the extent that she discovers and correlates these secondary causes she is obeying "one of the most admirable impulses in the human mind—the impulse to explain and to understand—and to explain if possible through simple, familiar, and ordinary causes." This need not be discouraged. Here and there some teacher or some system may swing to an extreme, but it can be only temporary, for the final balancing of factors will require the largest room for both the supernatural and the natural. All these processes will only expand our conception of God. The Lutheran Church lays upon her teachers no stricture that interferes with true scientific pursuit.

Scholastic attainment in our teaching force is indispensable—but it is not all. The teacher is to have a passion for his Church. That passion is not to be misdirected, uninformed, or prejudiced, but it is to be so clear, so informed, so strong, that it will compel a conviction from those who come under its influence.

The character of the teaching force is of primary importance. If we are to have Lutheran scholars and a Lutheran education, our teachers must have a two-fold qualification—they must be educators, and they must be Lutherans. They should be educators possessing the fine art of making their pupils so thirsty that they will want to drink at the fountains of knowledge. They should be Lutherans of such culture, such sense, such enthusiasm, that their pupils will catch the inspiration of a splendid devotion to the Church of their fathers.

## 2. *The Moral and Religious Life of a Lutheran School.*

A Lutheran School is to be a moral and religious organism. It is not a machine for manufacturing men and women. It is to be a fertile and well-tilled garden,

where all the graces and accomplishments of Christian young men and young women can grow. The primary responsibility for this condition lies with the administrative and governing boards and the teaching force of the institution. There is no graver problem than the maintaining of a proper moral and religious life in our institutions of learning.

The institution is to stand *in loco parentis*. Every child who enters the institution is a trust from pious and praying parents. He has been baptized with a mother's tears of joy and sorrow, he is the object of a father's hopes and ambitions. The college is looked to and rightly so, to safeguard all his true interests. He is sent there not simply for the sake of a diploma, but to find his place in life. Nothing should be left undone towards his proper guarding, guiding, inspiring and convicting. All this involves a responsibility that is overwhelming. The interests of parents and friends, the interests of the Church, the interests of society are involved. No man ought to accept a place as teacher or administrator who does not feel in the depths of his being, that this is to be his primary concern, and that his love will be sufficient to constrain him to faithful and untiring service.

This problem of the religious life in the college belongs not simply to the college—but it belongs to the Church at large. If the young men and young women in our Lutheran institutions of learning are kept and trained anew in love and devotion to their Church during their college years, and are then sent out into the world with a burning zeal to labor for her, we may rest assured that the Church will be safe and progressive during their generation. Our Lutheran boys and girls should receive, in their years of collegiate training, a new birth into their Church, a better understanding of her history, a clearer insight into her problems, a broader outlook upon her opportunities. In this day of complex and constantly complicating forces, the point of contact between church and college suffers the heaviest strain. There is deep and well-founded apprehension of danger to the church college. Many colleges of other denomina-

tions have been swept away from their moorings. We may be thankful indeed that our own institutions are still standing on the church rock on which they were founded. But we must not close our eyes to the dangers of the hour. These dangers are from without, and from within. The external dangers are due to the heavy pressure which is being brought to bear by colossal funds which are to be distributed among institutions on certain conditions. So far as those conditions call for higher standards of scholarship, no one should object. But any attempt, direct or indirect, to undermine the religious basis on which a Church School was founded, and to dilute or to turn aside the type of Christian life which it was intended to protect and to foster, should be spurned as a high crime against the Church. If a college or a Church desires to change its type of life and instruction, let it do so, but let it not be done for money.

Another outside pressure upon Church Schools comes from the aggregate college world. This is a standardizing of courses of study in arts, languages, sciences, and philosophy, to such an extent that there is no possible room for study of the Christian faith. The Bible is having a hard fight for a place not only in the schools of the State, but also in many schools of the Church. The specialists in our college faculties can offer bewildering and impractical courses, but the time for the Bible and its allied studies is reduced to a minimum. Whenever an effort is made to give more time to the proper study of the Bible, the reply is that we must keep up to the standards of other colleges. There is danger of our college graduates becoming top-heavy with science and philosophy, but lacking a sufficient foundation of the facts and experience of the Christian religion. Lutheran education should cover both spheres of learning, the secular and the religious. It is an adjustment which can be made. Our boys and girls who go from Lutheran homes to Lutheran Colleges should have rigid courses of study in all that properly belongs to academic training, but they should have also equally rigid courses in the science of religion under the most competent instructors that

the Church can afford. It is no credit to the Church of the 20th century that in many of her schools the study of the Bible is considered a farce. At a time when the home is failing as never before to impart religious instruction to the children, it is inexcusable to pass it by in the Christian college with a weak and shamefaced effort.

Beginning in the Preparatory Departments and continuing through each of the four collegiate years our Lutheran boys and girls should be given the ablest instruction in the Bible itself. It is not books about the Bible, but the Bible itself which ought to be studied. A boy or girl who graduates from a Lutheran school without a clear, connected, and accurate view of the Scriptures, without a knowledge of the underlying truths of Scripture in their proper arrangement and development, and without proper direction as to the interpretation of Scripture and safeguards against its misuse, has not been treated fairly by his Church nor by his college. This study of the Bible should be during no year an elective study. The Lutheran Church has placed too high a value on the Bible as the Word of God to leave the study of it to the option of her children. We do not mean that it is to be a forced study. It is not to be a mechanical study—a study just for study's sake—but it is to be made the most absorbing, inspiring, thought compelling subject of the whole course. This can be done, but it can only be done by an instructor who has a combination of highest religious and teaching qualities. Allied studies are to be required, and to be pursued during part of the collegiate course, such as Christian Evidences, Ethics, and Church History, and particularly the history of our own Church. All this is absolutely necessary in a Lutheran education. These young men and young women are needed in the Church. They will belong to different occupations and professions, and the Church looks to them for leadership. How can she expect them to be trained leaders if she has not furnished them the training? Our future leaders, clerical and lay, must be "wise master builders." They must know the Gospel in its purity, and they must have

a large comprehension of its length and breadth and depth and height. They must know the age in which they are living, with all the varied forces and theories, and they must be able to present the pure and comprehensive Gospel.

The Church should at once take up this problem of training. Perhaps this will lead necessarily to the broadening of the scope of the theological seminary or the college so as to offer courses for Sunday School teachers and officers as well as for other positions in the Church. Such a plan properly inaugurated and properly directed would tie the college or the seminary close to every pastorate. What greater blessing could come than that? From what do we suffer more heavily than the separation which exists between a Church and her schools. Join our Lutheran colleges and seminaries close to every pastorate in a common and sympathetic purpose and you have at once solved the problem of the proper support of our schools.

We have been discussing the moral and religious life which belongs by right to a Lutheran School, and what such a life will naturally produce in the way of teachers for the Church. There needs to be a thoroughgoing awakening of the whole Church on this issue. Bishop McDowell has recently spoken a forceful word on this whole matter. "The ideal of making youth Christian while in college, if it is not Christian, when it comes to college is the point of all I am wanting to say. I can not escape the influence that surrounded me in the days when I went to college. I can not while I live cease to be grateful, not that I fell into the hands of some one specially designated to do it, not that I fell into the hands of an association secretary who had in his hand the whole working of the Christian life of the institution, but that in those old days I fell into the hands of a faculty, which faculty felt itself under a divine compulsion to do what it could to induce young fellows like me to give themselves to Jesus Christ. The evangelistic agency for the college student should not be turned over to anybody with a raw method, a raw theology, and raw everything else.



"The aim of the Christian college should be to develop the best scholarship in the world and the best teaching in the world. We must do that as well as it is done anywhere else. There is no substitute anywhere for the Christian spirit of that body of men and women who constitute the teaching body of an institution. You would not turn the intellectual life of the institution over to anybody else; and I can not see that we are justified in turning the religious life over to anybody else." And then Bishop McDowell concludes with the following significant words, "Brethren, we have come in the matter of our life to such a crisis as the Christian college never faced before. If Christianity breaks down as a world force, it will break down because the Christian colleges are inadequate in the day of trial. Never did Jesus Christ need the right kind of Christian college in His world as He needs that Christian college to-day."

These are the words of a careful observer of the times, and his words are not an exaggeration. Applied to our own Lutheran institutions, they raise questions which our Church and her institutions will have to answer. Do the men and women who constitute the teaching force of our institutions seek first the kingdom of God and His righteousness in the trust which has been placed upon them? Are they men and women who pray and labor for the spiritual as well as the intellectual welfare of their students, and are they men and women who bear upon their hearts the burden of the Church's need for trained and devoted leaders. Every teacher in a Lutheran school should keep constantly before him that his great responsibility is to train men for the Church.

Whatever occupation our young people may choose, they must be made to feel that they are to be whole-hearted Lutherans. Not that only. In a time when there is such pressing need for pastors, every teacher in our academies and colleges should use his position and influence to help proper young men to choose the ministry. Any Lutheran teacher who takes this need lightly and indifferently, is not worthy to be a teacher in a school which was established first of all to give to the Church an educated

ministry. There are too many boys and young men capable of becoming ministers of the Word, who are slipping through our fingers. The fault for this is to be distributed over a large area. Society, the home, the local Church, have not simply failed in this matter, but in some instances they have put forth no effort, and in others, sad to relate, they have been antagonistic.

Our colleges with all their teachers have their share of the responsibility also. Anything that is left undone or anything that is tolerated in the Church school which may be antagonistic to the securing of young men for the ministry is a double sin. The social life of the institution must be guarded carefully, so that practices, customs, amusements which are detrimental to the best interests of the students, shall not be permitted. Dancing has no rightful place in a Lutheran college which was established to help men into the ministry. One does not need to be an extremist to see that dancing, and the allurements that accompany it, will help no young man into the ministry, but that it can easily turn young men aside from the ministry. As to the general effect of dancing upon the religious life of young people gathered in our Church schools, it is not in our province to speak. But in so far as it creates an unwholesome atmosphere, in which young men and young women are to live during a moulding period of life, young men and young women whom we have a right to expect to become leaders in the Church, dancing is positively harmful, and wherever or whenever it is allowed in a Church school the Church should cry out against it. There are other problems in the social life of students which need the most careful supervision of the whole Church. The question is raised whether fraternity life among students is antagonistic to their spiritual life, and especially does it turn men aside from the ministry? This question needs to be faced honestly and fairly. There are extremists on both sides. If, however, it can be shown that fraternities in Lutheran colleges, either directly or indirectly, have an influence against the call to the ministry, then the voice of the

Church at large should cry aloud. In the adjustment of these difficulties we should ever bear in mind the temper and principles of our Church. The Lutheran Church is not puritanic. She is not legalistic. She does not exercise discipline according to the letter, but she does exercise discipline according to the Spirit.

In referring to the teaching force, and to the moral and religious life of our schools we have called attention to the two main factors which have to do with the higher education of our Lutheran youth. In contemplating this we have much for which we can be thankful. God has given us great, good, and strong men in the past, who have been willing to spend and to be spent for the cause of education. We have a long and noble list of Lutheran educators. They have labored, and the Church of to-day has entered into the reward of their labor. God in His goodness and in His care for the Church, has raised up for us other men to continue this educational work. We believe that the teachers of our Lutheran schools are the equal in scholarship and ability to teach, with any other body of teachers, State or ecclesiastical, in this country. We would have it so and we would still press on to higher aims. Not only do we have a good teaching force in our schools, but we have a great body of Lutheran students who are earnest, capable, aspiring, Godfearing and church-loving young men and young women. If we could summon before our mind's eyes the faces of these thousands of young men and young women of the whole Lutheran Church, and see their keenness of intelligence, their physical, mental, moral, and spiritual equilibrium, and could hear the beating of their strong hearts, eager to do a worthy work in the world for the Church which gave them birth, we would thank God and take courage. Yes, we have much to be thankful for. But we must press on. We wish our schools to be equipped to the highest efficiency. Every teacher must know his work, and must know himself to be a servant of his Church. We not only want to have the best colleges and theological seminaries, but we want a constant propaganda for Lutheran boys and girls—a propaganda that should be-

gin with the child in the cradle and follow him to the day of his graduation. We want a race of Lutheran parents who will give money wisely for the education of their children and who will want their children to have a Lutheran education. Fathers and mothers ought to be made to feel the irresistible claims of the Church upon their children. There are hundreds and thousands of the finest kind of Lutheran boys and girls who are not getting the higher education of the Church. This means an incalculable loss. It is a loss, however, which can be prevented. The Church has been too timid in claiming her right. Our administration of educational matters should be so centralized and systematized that her strong arm could reach out to every home, so that no capable boy or girl should be neglected. This arm should reach to every little Church among the hills or on the plains and the Church should say of this barefoot boy, "This child belongs to me. I must have him." An equal claim should be made upon capable young women growing up in the Church. It is time for the Church to claim her superior rights. It would be a blessing to a hundred and a thousand homes to-day, if the Church would assert her claim.

A significant editorial appeared recently in one of our Lutheran papers. It bore the striking title, "Can the Lutheran Church Hold On and Hold Out?" It called attention to some well-grounded apprehensions—"That the pressure of a fitful, unstable and sentimental Protestantism—whose great catchwords are liberality and fellowship rather than fidelity and consistency—will sooner or later rob the Lutheran Church of all that makes it distinctive. There has been a remarkably subtle and all-pervading process of disintegration in matters of faith going on during the past generation, and ten years hence it will be more powerfully felt than now. It is what-do-I-care-for-your-creed? spirit with which the Lutheran Church has to reckon. Fellowship and union at all hazards is the watch-word of Christians to-day, and fellowship in the faith and union on the basis of faith only are as far from the thought of men as heaven is from earth.

There is a clamor for conventions and movements of a general character where convictions must be stifled, and the distinctive building up and expanding of the Church's inner life and power are made to suffer. It is this indefiniteness, this tendency to reduce all things to a common level whether they fit together or not, which constitutes the greatest menace to the Lutheran Church to-day." These words of the editorial are not overstatements. The Lutheran Church has a system of doctrine, a culture, a conception of the Christian life which is not likely to appeal to the superficial. The pressure of an unstable and sentimental Protestantism is very great. Can the Lutheran Church hold on to her life, and hold out against other types of life? The answer will depend on whether we are educating our children aright. Pastors and teachers in season and out of season should lay the foundations well in catechetical instruction. The ablest should be chosen for the higher education of the Church for which ample provision on the part of the whole Church should be made. This higher education must also be Lutheran—Lutheran teachers, Lutheran ideals, Lutheran culture, Lutheran atmosphere. Put the brightest and the best of our sons and daughters into such an atmosphere, and they will grow into stable, intelligent, enthusiastic men and women, to whom the Church of the coming generations can safely look for leadership. We are pleading to-night for our own children and our own Church. We want young people of other Churches, and young people of no Church, to come to our Lutheran colleges, but we must not try to bait them with a colorless Lutheranism. Lutheranism in the highest form is not offensive. Like its Lord it is a drawing force, rather than a driving force. Lutheranism need not always carry its label but it should never lose its character. If Lutheran schools begin to be like Presbyterian schools, Methodist schools, Congregational schools, then our children might as well go to those schools or to State schools. There is only one way to perpetuate our Church, and that is to give our children higher Lutheran education.

But we are pleading for more than this. Our cause is

the kingdom of God in and through the Church of Jesus Christ. We have a contribution to make to the common aggregate of Christianity for which our Lord the Head of the Church will hold us responsible. If the Lutheran Church fails to make her contribution, we may well ask who will make the contribution for her. It can not come from the Reformed branch of Protestantism. Reformed theology leads too easily to a legalistic religion, and a legalistic religion can easily become mere moralism. Perhaps it is this tendency of a theology or lack of a theology which has necessitated a recent appeal on the part of a voluntary committee of one of the great and honored denominations of this country, an appeal signed by 201 ministers and laymen from 23 States, urging the pastors and teachers and officials of that great Church to unite in action in defense of the fundamentals of the Christian faith, and in view of the deep unrest in the religious thought of the day, to place pronounced and persistent emphasis on the authority and integrity of the Bible as the Word of God, on the Deity of our Lord Jesus Christ, and on His vicarious atonement on the cross, and on the resurrection. The appeal and the letter which accompanied it are very significant. It is a humiliation to the whole Church that such a letter had to be written. God be praised for the men who wrote it, and may He answer their prayers.

But with all charity and humility be it said that any theological system which recognizes any other center than Jesus Christ, the justification-by-faith-alone center, and salvation from sin, from death and from the devil simply and solely through the merits of our Lord, that system as it finds expression in preaching and in life, will at times lose its balance and an adjustment will have to be made.

Lutheranism we believe has found the true center around which she makes everything to revolve. The diameter of this circle reaches all the way from the first verse of Genesis to the last of Revelation, and its circumference is as comprehensive as God's redemptive plan. When the Holy Catholic Church of the future comes into

that unity of spirit for which our Lord prayed, we believe that its theology will be very near to that of the Lutheran Church.

When we are asking for Lutheran education we are asking for the largest and most comprehensive education which can be obtained—an education which will prepare our children for every sphere of useful employment in the Church's name, and an education which will also fit them for their citizenship which is in heaven from whence also we wait for a Savior the Lord Jesus Christ.

*Hamma Divinity School,  
Springfield, Ohio.*



## ARTICLE VII.

## REVELATION AND DOGMATICS.

BY J. S. SIMON, D.D.

Theology is the noblest of all the sciences. In purpose it is also the most practical. The great dignity of its object, the supreme value of the truths which it arranges and confesses, the certainty of the facts with which it deals, and the intensely practical character of the conclusions at which it arrives set it apart and mark it as the divinest of all the departments of knowledge. Its object is the self-revelation of God; the truth which it receives for study and scientific arrangement is that truth for whose sake the whole course of sacred history was supernaturally guided to a culmination in Jesus Christ, the Personal Truth; its certainty is tremorless, resting upon a "Thus saith the Lord"; its conclusions are concerning God and man, Jesus Christ, the Holy Spirit, the Church, and the consummation of all things. What science can be more practical than that which deals with these great questions without whose solution, in a right way, man cannot be blessed, questions which he cannot solve with satisfaction and certainty unless he be brought into contact with the great object of theological science, Revelation? To know God and Jesus Christ whom He hath sent, which is eternal life, surely is not to be classified as impractical. John, in the well known words of his gospel, "But these are written, that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing, ye might have life through His Name," expresses the practical character of revelation, and the same moral and spiritual end is in the view of all true theological science.

Physical science endeavors to find out God by tracing His footprints in the physical universe and, at best, it can discover only "His eternal power and Godhead," it cannot even guess at a redeeming God, and, at its poor-

est, it deifies nature and degrades man: philosophy, forgetting that God has said, "For my thoughts are not your thoughts, neither are your ways my ways, saith Jehovah. For as the heavens are higher than the earth, so are my ways higher than your ways, and my thoughts than your thoughts," attempts the impossible task of finding out God by wisdom, hoping to stretch its little finite thought over the thought of the Infinite God so as to completely cover it: theology undertakes the humbler task of thinking the thoughts of God after Him and of interpreting a supernaturally guided history which records not alone the coming of God to man but His coming into humanity, "the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us."

The aim of Christian Theology is intensely practical. It deals with indispensable objects of thought. Its thinking is not for the sake of thinking. Its chief concern is not with thoughts but with truth. It moves not in the realm of intellections but in the world of facts. Its final purpose is expressed in the words of Paul, "That I may know Him, and the power of His resurrection, and the fellowship of His sufferings, becoming conformed unto His death, if by any means I may attain unto the resurrection of the dead."

It is not difficult to see that the "deep things of God" lie entirely outside the realm of physical science. Concerning them it can be only a usurping judge. It cannot know them, for neither are they discovered in the laboratory nor expressed in physical phenomena. The challenge which physical science can never take up is a long standing challenge, "Canst thou by searching find out God? Canst thou find out the Almighty unto perfection?"

And the case is not essentially different when it comes to the relation of theology and philosophy. In its attempt to explain the universe philosophy, by the rules of the game of pure thinking, excludes all wisdom save its own. It thinks the thoughts of the "natural man." Its mind is the mind of the "natural man." The great expert in theology, Paul, declared long ago, "The natural

man receiveth not the things of the spirit of God; for they are foolishness unto him; and he cannot know them, for they are spiritually discerned." These very positive words declare that the effort of philosophy to explain the universe is necessarily an unending failure, for by its very nature it is absolutely shut out of the largest and most important part of the universe.

The attempt of philosophy is a most daring one. The thinking ego, taking its place in infinite empty space, by step after step of necessary thought, undertakes to create the universe ideally which God created really. Philosophy endeavors to think God's thoughts, scorning the use of a pattern; material science tries to think God's thoughts after Him, but without His aid; theology thinks God's thoughts after Him by the aid of His chart of Revelation and under the enlightening power of His Holy Spirit. A self-sufficient material science speaks as its last word concerning God, "I do not know." It is scientifically "agnostic," sometimes unscientifically "atheistic." Philosophy speaks as its last word concerning God, who can tell what? for its voice is like the noise of Babel, but the prevailing mode seems to be "monism." Theology speaks as its last concerning God, the great word, "The God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ."

The "modern mind" denies to theology the right to be classed as a separate science on the ground that it makes impossible the "unity of knowledge," which means so much to it. But the truth is that theology alone can bring about a real unity of knowledge. It confesses Jesus Christ as the center of all things, the home of all true thought, the explanation of the universe, the real union of God and man, in whom will be the consummation of all things. Let all who seek rest in the unity of knowledge ponder deeply the great words of a very great thinker. They are profoundly philosophic, deeply religious, and wholly dogmatic. They reveal a real unity, not merely an ideal one. They come with the force of a great revelation and the certainty of their truth abides through all the assaults of "science falsely so-called," and of the opposition of philosophy, "after the rudiments

of the world." I refer to the words of Paul concerning Christ Jesus Our Lord, "Who is the image of the invisible God, the firstborn of all creation; for in Him were all things created, in the heavens and upon the earth, things visible and things invisible, whether thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers; all things have been created through Him and unto Him; and He is before all things, and in Him all things consist. And He is the Head of the body, the Church, who is the beginning, the first born from the dead; that in all things He might have the pre-eminence."

Take but two or three clauses out of this truly wonderful characterization of Jesus Christ, "the image of the invisible God," "All things have been created through Him and unto Him"; "He is before all things"; "In Him all things consist"; and it is not difficult to understand how more than foolish, how almost farcical, is the attempt to explain the universe, "the all things," by a philosophy which denies, or ignores, or even neglects Jesus Christ. "By Him were all things made; and without Him was not anything made that was made." Here are affirmed two distinct entities, "He," the Creator, and the "all things," the creation. Without Jesus Christ the universe has no beginning, "All things have been created through Him." Without Him the universe would disappear, "In Him all things consist." Without the Son of God the universe has no proper end, "All things have been created unto Him." The universe is a sealed book, and all the accumulated wisdom of the world cannot break the seals, "The world by wisdom knew not God." Not only is the universe a sealed book but God is also "the unknown God" to the wisdom of the world. Surely that is but a trifling explanation of the universe which never comes to the knowledge of the true God, which never breaks forth with praise, "The heavens declare the glory of God, and the firmament sheweth His handiwork. Day unto day uttereth speech, and night unto night sheweth knowledge." Beyond question, that is but a trifling explanation of the universe which cannot know that Jesus Christ

is the head of the body, the Church, and which fails to confess His pre-eminence over all things.

Theology, in the broader scope of the science, or Dogmatics in the narrower, is the science of faith. It comes to its task believing that God is. It does not create an ideal god by thinking, but by faith it knows Him as Creator, "By faith we understand that the worlds have been framed by the Word of God." It does not depend chiefly, nor even greatly, upon the philosophical proofs of God, for it already knows the infallible proof, Jesus Christ, "The only begotten Son, Who is in the bosom of the Father, He hath declared Him."

And yet Dogmatic science is the science of certainty. Its greatest teachers use these words much, "We know." They do not say about their declarations, "It is probable," or "it seems to be so." It holds its facts and truths not as mere propositions for debate, but as dwelling in Him who is the fullness of truth, who is personal Truth. One of the first and, greatest dogmaticians declares, "I know whom I have believed." Another sets forth great positive facts, not with labored argument and yet with utmost positiveness, "And we know that the Son of God is come, and hath given us an understanding, that we know Him that is true, and we are in Him that is true, even in His Son Jesus Christ. This is the true God and eternal Life."

In these great declarations of Paul and John, as well as in all the writings of the primitive Church, we hear not even a hint of the whine of doubt so characteristic of the religious and philosophical output of the modern mind. They lived in a world of certainties. The light which shined upon their thinking was above the brightness of the sun at noonday. And yet they lived in an age of doubt. They were sent to a world whose gods were dead. Everywhere was heard the sad cry of orphanage, "Great Pan is dead." To the spiritually-dead world of their day they offered eternal life. To a despairing humanity, whose priests and philosophers were discredited, they brought hope. To an orphaned world they proclaimed the Heavenly Father. To an enslaved

world they preached liberty. They conquered the world by their gospel, not by using the methods of the schools but in the face of the opposition of the schools, not by the aid of the wise men but by declaring foolish the wisdom of men, by their complete and perfect certainty of the absolute truth of their gospel, "This is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith," by their sublime realism, by the proclamation of great and glorious facts of redemption.

Do we not see in these facts more than a hint, even a great word of wisdom, for an age of doubt? The cure for doubt is not more doubt, it is not even a paring down of truth. "Like is cured by like," is not true of the world's great malady whatever may be thought of it in medicine. Doubt yields itself only to faith. The times of return to God and of great spiritual power have always been the times of certainty, of a true gospel realism. The correction for denials of the faith and wanderings from God has always been just a return to the primitive faith. Restoration of the true Church is by reformation not by evolution or by revolution. The cure for corruption in doctrine and in life is not to be found elsewhere than in the objective facts of the gospel, as proclaimed by the Apostles. To them God was very real and very near. They knew that their eyes had looked upon the Incarnate God, and that their hands had touched Him. Sin was for them an awful reality and the Atonement by the blood of the Cross a glorious fact. Though unlearned and ignorant men, these founders of the primitive Church showed a remarkable self-sufficiency, as over against all human wisdom. But it was not the pride of wisdom that showed itself in their self-sufficiency, it was the humility of faith, "Our sufficiency is of God." Their faith had in its possession "the depth of the riches both of the knowledge of God and of the wisdom of God" and so could well be bold in the face of the opposition of "science, falsely so-called."

The primitive Church could face a world of overwhelming wickedness with courage because it knew Christ the "power of God and the wisdom of God." It

preached no schemes for moral improvement other than the gospel itself. It had no ethical message separate from the word of the Cross. It proclaimed no crusade against giant evils, intrenched in human custom. It felt no imperative to conduct revolutions and overthrow tyrannical governments. Its program seemed very narrow, "We preach Christ crucified," but in reality it was very broad, "God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son." Its preachers were called "unlearned and ignorant men," but they knew the point of union for God and His universe—the Incarnation. The modern mind would certainly not classify them with the wise men but they knew of a way of reconciliation for a sinful world which alone has been able to give abiding peace to the human conscience, the method of the Cross. To the whole world, worshipping at the altar of the "unknown God," these men could say with utmost confidence, "Him, whom ye ignorantly worship, declare we unto you." They boldly challenged all idolatries, met the scorn of proud wisdom, gave defiance to long established custom and universal passion, and overcame them by "the Word of their testimony and the blood of the Lamb."

What made these first preachers of the gospel so bold? One of them tells those who opposed them, and us, "We cannot but speak the things which we have seen and heard." Those things which they preached were "most surely believed among them." They were not dealers in cunningly devised fables, but witnesses unto great and heart-compelling facts. They had received from God what they declared to men. Their certainty was not the partial certainty of human knowledge but the perfect certainty of faith. It was not the assurance of the seeker after truth but the assurance of those unto whom the God of truth had come with a revelation of Himself. They had not discovered the truth for themselves, neither had they only heard of it by the hearing of the ear, but they had looked upon the Personal Truth.

The ground of certainty is an objective revelation. It is not a something which men have dreamed, or which they have intellectually discovered, or which has come



at the end of a process of necessary thought, but it is an objective world of truths, revealed by means of historical facts, culminating in the greatest of all facts, Jesus of Nazareth, the Word made flesh. Faith knows that the light which shines "in the face of Jesus Christ" is the glory of God. This revelation is a realm of truth high above the world in which pure science moves, and it is an unknown land to philosophy, "Things which eye saw not, and ear heard not, and which entered not into the heart of man, whatsoever things God prepared for them that love Him. But unto us God revealed them through the Spirit." Hence what science knows, and what philosophy thinks, cannot modify, or make of none effect, or destroy the truth of revelation. These have no jurisdiction there and, at most, can only be the handmaidens of faith. Faith has a realm all its own. Revelation is to faith, "These are written that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ."

But that Revelation is a *sure* word of prophecy, or that "no prophecy ever came by the will of man, but men spake from God, being moved by the Holy Spirit," this is just what the wisdom of this world, in its pride of intellect, will not admit. And so Revelation has become the storm center of the world's opposition to the Kingdom of God. Worldly wisdom knows that it can make no headway in its assault upon the certainty of faith so long as the heart accepts the actuality of the historical revelation and considers that "Christ made manifest in the flesh" is not a mere notion but a great fact. The assumption evidently is that Revelation is efficient for faith and its certainty. The only way to destroy faith is to destroy its ground, Holy Scripture. Holy Scripture, which is the Spirit controlled record of God's self-manifestation in human history, is adapted to faith as physical facts and phenomena are adapted to knowledge. And so the great modern assault is made upon Holy Scripture. The destructive criticism of the Bible is the sharpest sword ever forged in the smithy of hell against the kingdom of God and were it not for the promise of God, "No weapon that is formed against thee shall prosper; and every

tongue that shall rise against thee in judgment thou shalt condemn," the outlook would indeed be dark. But we believe that already the latter part of the promise is being fulfilled and that the Church is awaking out of its nightmare of unfaith and that speedily it will condemn the baseless theories and the unbelieving assumptions of those who mutilate the Word of God. One thing seems clear, the Church must either keep its Bible intact or it must give up its Lord and Saviour, for it is evident that the Christ of those who believe the Bible to be the very Word of God and the Christ of those who produce the "New Theology" by additions to, and subtractions from, the Bible are not the same Christ; "For their rock is not as our Rock, even our enemies themselves being judges." That is a different faith in kind, not only in degree, whose God is imprisoned in His own laws and who can reveal himself only through the operation of those laws, which eliminates miracle from the Bible to please its conception of God, that is a different faith in kind from the faith of the Christian who accepts the Bible as a sacred history, a true record of the self-manifestation of God in human history and life. Some "scholarship" declares that God cannot operate supernaturally to make Himself known to man, but it does not inform us where man, just as much shut up by natural law as God, and beside, limited by finiteness, got that bit of supernatural information as to what God cannot do. Reasonableness is with the contrary assumption. Given the Christian conception of God and a self-revelation to His creatures becomes a most reasonable and divine act, a very necessity of love; "God so loved the world, that He gave His only begotten Son." Revelation can be successfully denied, in the face of the Bible, only on the assumption of one or all of three ideas as truth; God is not free, or He is not love, or man does not need the revelation of Himself, and all of these assumptions are denied by the Bible. God is free, he can reveal himself. God is love, He would desire to reveal Himself. Man needs a revelation of God and because God is love He would give such a revelation.

Now, the Christian conception of God is itself drawn

out of the Bible. How came it there? It is not the product of the modern mind, which seems to think it can create a better conception of God. Devout people feel that only in a secondary and minor sense can it be the product of the mind of man at all. The human mind could not have produced Jesus Christ ideally. He is not the product of pure thinking. Man has manufactured many ideal characters. Profane literature shows us the best he can do, and that best is infinitely poorer than the Christ of the Bible. The mind of man could not have invented the God-Man. But we have His picture in the Bible. It is absolutely perfect. Even those who hate its moral perfection because it condemns their villainess have not been able to find any fault in it. Such a picture is in the Bible, and it is the delineation of a living reality, drawn from a real and living Divine-human model, or it is an ideal creation. The latter is an impossible conclusion. That picture is drawn from life. The whole fraternity of those who reject the Bible may well be asked, "What shall we then do with Jesus, which is called Christ?" for it is becoming increasingly evident that they are mutilating beyond recognition the one perfect picture in the possession of men—the Bible portrait of the Son of Man. Many who are more generous with those truths which belong to the Bible than they are with their own opinions have said, "If criticism leave us Christ, it may take everything else," but as a matter of fact it does not leave us the Christ of the Bible.

There are those who very generously concede to criticism the right of final judgment in the history recorded in Scripture, reserving for faith the gospel contained in the history. They give away more than they keep. The history which they turn over to its enemies is a *sacred history*. It is the record of the supernatural acts of God through which He made Himself known. It is a record for the making of which men "were moved by the Holy Spirit." It is a miraculous history, the counterpart of the miracle of the Incarnation. Suppose, then, for the sake of amiability, we give naturalistic criticism the final word concerning sacred history. It will elimi-

nate every thought of the supernatural. The Virgin Birth, the sinless life of Jesus Christ, the miracles He wrought, His vicarious death upon the Cross, His resurrection, His ascension to glory, the outpouring of the Holy Ghost; all these great historical facts, which have been for faith a ground of certainty, vehicles of "The glorious gospel of the blessed God," criticism would empty of their supernatural content. It might leave enough for philosophy, but faith would perish with famine, even while feeding upon such food.

It is quite true that the gospel itself is sufficient for faith, that it rests upon Him whom the history sets forth and not upon the history, but surely the history itself is necessary, both for God and man, for the creation of faith, "These are written that ye might believe."

Here it may be well to notice that the declaration, "The Bible contains the Word of God," which was once so true as the formula of faith, is now so false as the formula of criticism. When faith said, "The Bible contains the Word of God," it did not separate contents and container but thought of an infallible Word in an infallible book; when criticism uses the very same words, it sharply distinguishes between contents and container and thinks of a book full of errors, which needs the aid of wisdom for the rescue of the Word of God from intermingled mistake and error. Faith confessed that God had put the pure revelation of Himself in a clean vessel, and that both were aseptic. Criticism contended, and contends, that God placed His self-revelation in a septic vessel and that it is the business of criticism to remove from it the consequent sepsis.

As a protest against the false attitude of criticism to the Bible, faith now uses a formula, definite, positive, unequivocal, "The Bible is the Word of God," and so maintains for itself a ground of certainty.

This perfect revelation of God is the object of Dogmatic Science. Its aim is to understand, and formulate, and classify the facts and truths of the Bible. Its dogmas are not mere opinions about truth. They are not the product of pure thinking. They are the great

thought-forms of conviction, arising from the contact of God, through His self-revelation, with the soul of man, and tested and corrected as to their human content, in the experience of all believers. Dogmatic science is, therefore, in a special manner, not individual, but of the Church, of the communion of saints. Dogma and faith are inseparable. Dogma is objective faith, it is faith in the form of confession. Dogmatics is the science of faith, and concerns itself with the most perfect statement, orderly arrangement, and systematic classification of the contents of a revelation, which faith holds to be infallibly true.

In the light of what Dogmatic Science is and of the limitations imposed upon it by its very nature, the shallowness of all criticism of it as an antiquated and useless study is made manifest. It will be useless when a clear knowledge of what God revealed in the Bible is useless, and not till then. It will be out of date when the fact and the guilt of sin are out of date and when the redemption that is in Jesus Christ is out of date. It will be thrown upon the scrap heap of human knowledge when the wisdom of the world can by searching find out the Almighty to perfection.

Dogmatic Science is a necessity for the Church. It was born on the day of Pentecost. It grew and waxed strong in conflict with Jewish unbelief. It rose to greatness in the death struggle of Christianity with Gnosticism. It manifested a giant's strength in the heroic days of Luther. It was more than conqueror in the age of German Rationalism and English Deism. It will yet lead captive to the obedience of Christ the vaunting wisdom of our day.

Dogmatic Science is necessary for the Church simply because the Church is a *confessing* Church. Its conquering weapon is the word of testimony. Its business is not to solve problems, or, in competition with the wisdom of the world, guess at their solution, but to proclaim the Divine solution of all problems, given for the use of the Church in God's holy word. The curse of the Church is just in the fact that so often its testimony is wavering,

lacking the certainty of faith, concerned about mere negations. But God meant His Church to be concerned with great affirmations. Its preaching is a witness bearing to certain infinitely great and glorious facts.

To quote, in a roundabout way, from Principal Forsyth:

"The Church must be dogmatic if it is to do the Church's work. It always has been. And those in closest touch with its redemptive action know it must be. A sentimental Savior cannot do anything with a hardened sinner; nor an ethical gospel reclaim a passion-bitten, sin-stung, and deadly poisoned world. Christianity has always tended to theology, doctrine and dogma. And that because not otherwise can a living, redemptive, regenerative Christ of the New Testament come to His own. Grace has always gravitated to dogma. The dogma does not do Christ's work, but you cannot publish or apply Christ's work without it. It cannot be severed from personal life (His or ours), but it is more than personal effect. It is not substitute for Christ's Person, but it is indispensable to grasp and tell what Christ is and does. Christianity is the practical establishment or restoration of a sinful race's communion with God. It is the recreation of a soul and the setting up of a kingdom. It means (centrally, if not in every case) a hearty and passionate turning from sin and to God's grace. It is a great agitation in us. And therefore it rouses much question from thought about its certainties, as surely as it stirs the action of heart and will towards them when we are sure. Heart and will crave for stability and knowledge..... Christianity is dogmatic or nothing. Men may come and men may go, preachers rise and fall, churches are gathered and churches are scattered, movements wax and fashions wane, but the age long and sublime confession in Christ of a gracious holy God, whether spoken as a theme or developed like a symphony endures in memorable thought and mood, filling amply the vast mind and golden mouth of the Church. It is the certificate of the wealth of its possession in Christ. It

is a monument of its power and freedom, and not a millstone to drown it in our choppy modern sea."

Dogmatic science is necessary for the continuity of the life and doctrine of the Church throughout the whole length of time.

There is one Church not only in space but in time. The Church of the Twentieth Century, if it be Christ's, must be one with the Church of the First Century. But this oneness of the Church is found to consist not in outward form, nor in uniform ceremonies, nor in likeness of governments, nor in sameness of language and race, but in dogmatic rightness. Peter said, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God," and Christ said, "Upon this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." The true oneness of the Church is found in dogmatic unity. Those sects which ignore the history of the Church in its confessions, and build upon other foundations than that of the Church, are but bubbles upon the stream of the life of the Church. Something absolutely both new and true in dogmatic science is inconceivable on the basis of a final revelation of God in Jesus Christ and of the fulfillment of Christ's promise to the Apostles of the Holy Ghost, "He shall lead you into all truth." As the mouth of a river finds connection with its source only along the whole course of its stream so the true Church of our day finds its connection with the primitive Church only along the whole course of the great testimony of Jesus Christ. The Church is one only in Christ, but it knows its oneness dogmatically.

Dogmatic Science is an essential for the ministry.

The great need of the preacher is theology. The preacher without theology is like the teacher without knowledge, or like a herald without a proclamation, or like a messenger without a message. The preacher needs theology as he needs piety, fundamentally. We hear it said that the world is weary of theology. Even if that were true it would be nothing new, for the world never had a particular fondness for a true Christian theology. But it is nearer the truth to say that the world is weary of the lack of theology on the part of some preachers,



weary of the religious experiments of men who are more anxious to draw a crowd than they are to be faithful to the word of God. It is declared by some thinkers who, no doubt with becoming modesty, advertise themselves "advanced thinkers," or perhaps even only "up to date," that if theology is to be resuscitated, it must adopt the theories and conclusions of the wisdom of the world. Rather, it must distinguish itself more clearly and positively from the wisdom of the world as having alone the gospel which is the power of God unto salvation. The Book that cannot lie sets it down as a fact that the "wisdom of the world did not know God." The same authority says that the "natural man cannot know the things of God." It would not be strange, therefore, if some very wise men and very great philosophers did not approve of the preaching of the gospel, but considered it foolishness, but their judgment weighs less than air in the judgment of the preacher who knows that "it pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe." What was true in Paul's day is true now, and not one whit less now than then, "We preach Christ crucified, unto the Jews a stumblingblock, and unto the Greeks foolishness; but unto us who are saved, both Jews and Greeks, Christ the power of God and the wisdom of God." How the power of God can be made weakness and the wisdom of God can be made foolishness even by the great theories and wonderful discoveries of "the modern mind," is beyond even the "modern mind" to tell. For the Christian preacher it is enough to know that "the foolishness of God is wiser than men."

Now, a preacher's theology, using the word in the large Christian sense, is the measure of his grasp of Jesus Christ. He is the bearer of the whole gospel to a world lost in sin and it is necessary not alone that he know the gospel subjectively as the ground of his own salvation, men cannot be saved by his experience, but also that he know it as a great objective fact in all its greatness, and glow, and grasp, and measure. Theology must not be trimmed down to suit the people, with the purpose of

drawing them; it must be completed to the measure of the uplifted Christ, and He will draw men.

It surely would be a great calamity to the Church if preachers were to take as their ideal of the ministry what was said of a certain evangelist, who "got results": "In not one of his seventy and more sermons and addresses did he use a single word of doctrine." God save the Church from a generation of preachers whose chief message is, "Quit your meanness, or you will go to hell." The Church has a full abundance of little reformers, self-commissioned prophets, self-advertised "illuminati," and what it needs is more preachers whose intellect, and heart, and will are completely mastered by the gospel, to whom the "moral poignancy of the Cross is so vast that it will thrust them forth into the world with a great judgment hanging over them for faithlessness, "Woe is me if I preach not the gospel."

Dogmatic Science is necessary as a test of all who preach "another gospel, which is not another."

The devil has become wiser and more subtle in his assaults upon the true faith. He seems to have a "modern mind" of his own. He tried to destroy the faith by killing its confessors, and failed. Then he tried to destroy the faith by an assault upon the minds of believers, denying the written Word, and he failed. Now he comes as one having superior and later revelations than those contained in the Word, and sits as an interpreter of that Word, and even in this he will fail. To illustrate, Christian Science, which, if it does not desire to live under a false name, ought to call itself "Anti-Christian Anti-Science," a mixture of false philosophy and of foolish imaginings, a so-called religion of glaring contradictions, lying testimonies, an unfaith mutilating the Word of the Lord, mentally creating a god without personality, seeing in the Christ of God only the unreal thing of a woman's thought, robbing the Cross of its glory, denying the resurrection, teaching that matter is non-existent, yet finding its only proof in the healing of physical bodies, this mental something says that it is the religion of the Bible.

And here comes one Charles T. Russell, a religious fraud, claiming to be some mighty prophet of God, whose chief dogma is that *Jesus Christ is forever dead*, a dogma that ought to damn his whole system into the deepest hell, whence it came, but he is the head, the very pope, of so-called "International Bible Student's Association," and of course, he speaks very bitterly against the dogmas and the doctrines of the Church.

One thing is clear, "No prophecy of Scripture is of private interpretation. For no prophecy ever came by the will of men: but men spake from God, being moved by the Holy Spirit." Interpretation does not come by the will of man, but from the Spirit of God who abides in the Church, and the Dogmatic Science of the Church, hence, becomes the expression of the mind of the Spirit, so far as the Church has been able to understand its great Interpreter. The promise of Jesus Christ to the Church is of profound significance, "He shall lead you into all truth." Its significance, in the limited sphere of our present discussion is just this: Any system of faith which claims to be Biblical must be able to prove itself in harmony with the universally confessed truths of the universal Church. A dogmatic system which is not churchly is also not biblical for the Bible is the book of the Church, interpreted by the Holy Spirit, and confessed by the theology of the Church.

Theology is of supreme value for the Church, and the Church that does not see to it that its theology is committed to the charge of competent men, who shall train other competent men for the proclamation of those truths that are most surely believed by the Church will quickly lose its power.

*Hagerstown, Md.*

## ARTICLE VIII.

## WAR LETTERS OF A PASTOR TO HIS COLLEAGUE.

BY K. V.

(Translated by Rev. W. A. Lambert).

Note by the Translator.—The three Letters of a Pastor to his Colleague here translated, were published in the *Monatschrift für Pastoraltheologie*, in the 5. "Kriegsheft," February, 1915. A number of reasons have led to their translation. They are an indication of the seriousness with which German pastors are considering their present problems and opportunities. They show us the insight which they have won not only into the immediate problems but also into the underlying principles and the far-off possibilities. No less can we read here the sense of responsibility which German pastors have within them.

But more vital than all of this, these letters really deal with problems and conditions which are not merely German; we in America, if we have tried to do our work faithfully and have studied our people carefully, must admit that frequently our "breath has also been almost taken away on the pulpit, when we have seen the sated self-righteous faces, and it seemed to us as if all our words returned to us without finding a place, without setting free our souls because they had found sympathetic souls." The war is teaching German pastors to acknowledge these things to themselves. Can we not learn from them to make the same acknowledgment for ourselves? Or are we satisfied also, eager only to close our eyes to realities and to comfort ourselves with theories? True, we have no war to affect us so nearly as the Germans have; God speaks to us through the far gentler voice of the modern evangelism. Does it teach us anything, does it drive us to study our responsibilities and our opportunities?

Perhaps the most interesting and most helpful suggestion in these letters is the distinction between the preacher of the Gospel and the teacher of Christian religion. Our dignity is hurt by it, no doubt. But is it not true? Can the great mass of us preachers claim to have a message that is personal and fresh, that grows out of deep experience, and therefore can reach into the experience of others? Are we not trained to be teachers of religion, not to be evangelists? How many of us can claim to be Spirit-anointed souls, filled with the Gospel which we cannot keep back? Is it not much rather true that even as teachers we teach only too frequently phrases instead of truths?

All these suggestions will doubtless be strongly resented by many. So hardened have we as preachers grown against the preaching of repentance. We are willing indeed to preach it to others, only let no man preach it to us! The preacher of repentance does not expect his hearers to agree with him. He has only one modest hope: that they will be stirred into thinking on these things for themselves. His despair is reserved for those who know that they need no repentance and therefore will not even weigh his words. But only they have reached this state who have lost the sense of personal responsibility, for whom all things are settled by others from whom they need only learn without thinking out for themselves even what the meaning is of the things they have learned.

*Lebanon, Pa.*

#### LETTER I.

##### THE PIETY OF THE PEOPLE.

Dear Friend: We live in the age of catastrophies. The conflagration is growing to gigantic proportions, and frightful is the extent of destruction. But what especially moves me is the fact that these fearful external calamities threaten also to destroy many inner possessions. It fills me with fear and anxiety lest the piety

of the people may in these times collapse entirely. We stand paralyzed as it were before the destroyed altars of a naive, eudaemonistic piety, and cannot comfort men, cannot build it up again. Sobbing and wringing their hands mothers and young widows assure me that they prayed without ceasing for their loved ones, gave them Testaments and tracts—Himmelsbriefe—to take with them, contributed generously to all offerings and collections, and that it was all in vain. At the very beginning of the war my friend K. assured me that the tracts would be greatly discredited. I could only agree with him. But what shall happen if there should be ten or twenty dead or severely wounded in our congregation? Must not every form of piety lose its value? Must it not bring about a religious bankruptcy in many families and in many individuals? For our kind of piety is after all beyond their reach, unintelligible, without foundation, without value for them. The piety of many will die of the fearful catastrophe, even be turned into its opposite: concerning that we as honest, clear-visioned men cannot give ourselves up to any delusions. Already in individual cases the madness of excitement on the battlefield is followed by the madness of despair among relatives at home. The fearfully serious present sweeps away unmercifully all half-hearted and perverted piety. What shall we do now? I have always until now treated with tender consideration the eudaemonistic piety of the people which innocently and with good intentions makes a contract with God. There is too much genuine piety imbedded in it. In its time and at its place it also has its relative truth and above all an overpowering practical value. But this piety of the First Psalm must be forcibly broken in pieces, however rich the Psalms are also in suggestions concerning the relations of the peoples to one another. When great calamities come our people must be at least prepared for thysiocentric piety. Permit me to coin the word for the sake of brevity. In the one case eudaemonia—happiness—is central, in the other thysia—sacrifice. Eudaemonistic piety is the childhood of all piety, it reaches maturity only in sacrifice. The transi-

tion is difficult for all of us, this transition from the First to the Seventy-Third Psalm. But now the people must learn it if piety is not to become for them mere bitter mockery. Peace gave only too much encouragement to the eudaemonistic piety, war knows only the thysiocentric piety. We must tell the people that our youth and men in so far as they are filled with a pure spirit are truly pious in their self-sacrifice for the fatherland. They do—quite in Luther's sense—a work well-pleasing to God. For in all self-sacrifice there is included also a genuine piety. Our fighters out in the field are just as pious as their parents and wives who at home fold their hands in true submission to God in their behalf. But the supreme guiding star of both must be, Thy kingdom come! Thy will be done! Our German people are now in an unrivaled school for the learning of piety. This opportunity we must make use of to the full. In pastoral acts we want to be real gentle, but the ground-tone of our preaching must now at all times and in all ways proclaim the highest aim of piety, Thy kingdom come! Thy will be done!

It is not only a life-question of piety, but of our Church as well. Let us see clearly and be brave; then will the catastrophe on this point also bring the piety of the people a good ways forward.

#### LETTER II.

##### THE GIVING OF COMFORT.

Dear Friend: You complain that your store of comforting thoughts gives out in all this manifold suffering. Yes, well for all who are true, Spirit-anointed comforters! We are beginning to learn that comforting is not such an easy matter, that we are much too poor in giving comfort. One must be very rich and much-trying to be able to "comfort" a little. But after all I say very plainly: It is not our duty *merely to comfort*. Even in times of peace the constant application of quietives is a miserable, hip-shot, wearisome, fruitless affair. Out of



twenty homes perhaps one is heavily hit by the war. Are we here then only for the twentieth? I hold that the nineteen are just as important. Out in the battles God is speaking a mighty language. This world-conflagration is an educator on a large scale and relentless; and we at home cannot get away from soft speeches. How does this fit together? I am afraid that many of us are miserably hindered by the soft, vain comforting from understanding the signs of the times. I repeat: This war is a unique educator, and shall we in our gentle-mindedness spoil its educative work? Then were we poor preachers of the great deeds of God. Until now we were frequently oppressed to see how sated the people were. They really fared too well. Even the most powerful prophetic preaching glanced from their sated soul without affecting it. Frequently it almost took my breath away on the pulpit, when I saw all the sated, self-righteous faces, and it seemed to me as if all my words returned to me without finding a place, without setting free my soul because they had found a sympathetic soul. The heart is stubborn and despairing. Just now this is especially evident. Until now satiety was the rock of granite from which the great thoughts of God glanced off; now it is despair and benumbing pain which makes the souls incapable of great purifying. Between this Scylla and Charybdis we must now energetically sail. The mass of the German populace is now experiencing directly or indirectly the enormous break of the times. Their souls are now open, warm, receptive. The fallen and their relatives are the exceptions. In their case we may do a special work. In the Church we have to do first of all with the mass of the congregation. Here it behooves us mightily to build, to strive, to purify, to lead upwards, that this world-conflagration may produce among us not merely a passing flare of the religious flame, but an enduring heart-searching, God-seeking, home-seeking, a reflection upon the best part of man, a turning to the better, purer, more worthy regions of thought, feeling and activity. Therefore above all else motives! It seems to me that every man must see this for himself, but alas!

of many I know that they are not able to interpret the mighty rushing and roaring which is now passing through the German forest, that there are children in the Spirit who are horrified to find that their priests are now not prophets, that many sated ones have suddenly developed a mighty hunger, not for the soft, sweet comfort, but for a burning Word of God. Let us understand the great time and make use of it; comforting is for the gleanings; for who knows whether God will in a thousand years again grant us so great a time.

### LETTER III.

#### MORALITY AND GOSPEL.

Dear Friend: I had thought you would understand me if I spoke of the preaching of moral law as our most important task. And you came to me also with the solemn assurance, We must preach the Gospel. Dear friend! That is to me, to say it bluntly, one of the most empty and most disgusting of phrases. There was a time when it impressed me also, and I personally needed the Gospel; and for a long time I as a preacher was under its influence. But more and more I was made to feel, that produces no effect! The people look upon the world and are weary and bored. I began to understand that *the Gospel must fall upon soil prepared for it*. The old watch-word remains eternally true: without Law no Gospel, without binding no setting free, without torment no comfort! For what does it mean, to preach the Gospel? It means to set free the religious quietives and to let them work alone. It means to free from their bonds the souls held in bondage. When Jesus, when Luther preached, they found a human race groaning under the bondage of a law. Then the glad tidings of redemption were in place. But humanity to-day is so little inclined to be legalistic that it much rather has an outspoken sympathy with antinomism. Are we to encourage this light-hearted playing even more by a misleading preaching of the Gospel? He who acts thus has with all his his-

torical knowledge no trace of a historical, particularly of a religious-historical sense. What such a sense does not tell him, a sound religious-ethical instinct ought to tell him. It is truly touching how boundlessly orthodox and traditional even many modern theologians are on this point. The sound religious sense of many a pietist and orthodox pastor is far ahead of them on this point. The preaching of Jesus cannot be copied into its details without modification for the present day. That were a very unspiritual, immature, legal method. For the preacher of the Gospel the exhortation of Paul is meant most of all, that he try that which is good and be no slavish imitator. For the public preaching of a Gospel the time will come again only when our people once more tremble before the earnestness of the moral law, when they feel ethical impotence and yearn for the liberating power of the Spirit. Before that time comes let us handle the pearl right cautiously, and not allow ourselves to be taken captive by time-honored phrases. In pastoral work, in pastoral acts, especially in cases of death, matters are frequently different. Then a word of comfort and of encouragement is frequently quite appropriate. But we are not to apply this without modification to the average attendant at Church service, especially in the country. It leads to conditions that are spiritually untenable. Our Church life grows thereby still more lax and fruitless. The living air and the strong incentive of the ethical-religious motives will be lacking. Yes, it often appears as if these religious quietives, that is the Gospel, would draw the last marrow out of the bones of the inner man for our Church attendants. How weak and tender they have become! Does the Catholic Church also treat its members so tenderly? There there prevails an entirely different discipline; there the strongest motives, a healthy legalism are to be found. And which of the two gets on the farthest? Oh, that God would once more send us a numerous company of manly preachers of repentance into our evangelistic pulpits! There would again spring up a fresh life. A wholesome trembling would again go through our evangelical people, and their hearts would

be gloriously prepared for a new "Comfort ye, comfort ye my people!" Then would we again experience with a joyous thrill what the Gospel is. Now we only speak about it, and honest men, men who look deeper, grow miserable because of the weakly, uncomprehending talk.

Sometimes I have been told that we as Christian preachers none the less have the duty of preaching the Gospel laid upon us, and that if we cannot do it the fault is ours. There is much truth in this. It demands an explanation. Certainly it is our duty to preach the Gospel, and yet more evident is it that so fearfully few can do it. Why is this? The critics of what I have said are right in finding a certain rugged onesidedness in me. And I will not modify it in the least. I insist upon it firmly. The decisive point is this, that only he can preach the Gospel who bears it in himself. That is a preacher who is a preacher by the grace of God. But all others are in the pulpit or in the professor's chair only teachers of the evangelical religion. The sad thing is that every honest, sincerely believing teacher thinks that he must now preach nothing but Gospel, and yet he does nothing with it all but thresh empty straw. The blessed natures, the men who do us good, before whom all our pride and stubbornness breaks like ice before the sun, these may preach Gospel. They cannot help it. They do it even when they do not at all intend to, just because they are an embodiment of the Gospel. Even when they preach morality, law, ideals, on their lips, in their presence these of themselves become Gospel: *the motives become quietives, and vice versa*. But such Spirit-anointed men and preachers are the exception. Ought every teacher of religion attempt to imitate them? Then we come to the miserable requirement which annuls itself: You must preach the Gospel. And these well-intentioned admonishers are mostly also so naive and blind as to believe in the success of their preaching of the Gospel. Either they live on strong religious traditions or on the friendly veil of faith in the invisible, or they are altogether unable to see what exists. It is a great advantage then if one comes to see, descends from the impossible height

on which one had taken his stand, and becomes satisfied to be a conscientious teacher of evangelical Christianity. The phrase about preaching the Gospel has done our Church untold injury since the days of Luther, and does so even to-day, although slowly the eyes of many are being opened. The fruitlessness and indolence of our evangelical Church is the fruit of a falsely understood duty to preach the Gospel. It is most high time that the conscience of the Protestant people be again in large measure awakened, that everywhere repentance be clearly preached, so that no one who is at all interested in the Church or even less interested can escape these stirring wave-beats. Within this task there still remains room for the Gospel. We do not proclaim our message like blustering Capuchins or stern police officials; that would be law in all its poverty and impotence; but into every ethical alarm we put something of a holy, redeeming longing and heartfelt sympathy. In such preaching of morality there lies a goodly portion of Gospel, even if we do not exactly belong to the blessed natures who beam with Gospel and therefore kill the law. So long as we feel ourselves uncertain, it is better for us to limit ourselves to clearly indicated educative tasks, and not to make a show of the glory which we have borrowed from the great ones in the kingdom of God. Most men get no farther than this: your first and most important duty is to make the majesty of the divine will as impressive as possible over against all human desires. It may be that thereby we will here and there help to bring in a time when the beatitudes may again take the place of calls to repentance.

## ARTICLE IX.

## CURRENT THEOLOGICAL THOUGHT.

I. IN ENGLISH. BY PROFESSOR J. A. SINGMASTER, D.D.

"Authority and Orthodoxy," the subject of a discussion in *The Constructive Quarterly* (June) by Rev. E. J. Widdows, an English Baptist clergyman, is one of the favorite phrases in which modern liberalism expresses itself. "Orthodoxy" as such has gone by the board, and "authority" is lodged in the individual man's perception of truth. This practically means that every man is a law unto himself, however ignorant he may be of the great fundamental principles underlying vital Christian faith. Writers of the class to which Mr. Widdows belongs set up men of straw and then pummel them. They select some ancient author, who may have presented truth in a most mechanical way, and then proclaim him to be the type of the modern Christian orthodox theologian. They fail to discriminate between the real content of theology and its expression. We believe that the ancient orthodoxy can be defended as to its content to-day with irrefutable proofs.

To show the superficial nature of liberal argument, we quote as follows: "More than half a million men in this country alone are meeting every Sunday afternoon in connection with the Brotherhood movement. These men are interested in religion, but they are suspicious of ecclesiastical systems and of formal doctrines. There is something too tyrannical about the former, something too mysterious and remote about the latter. Church doctrines men will no longer swallow with shut eyes and open mouths. They know now that doctrines are but statements of the interpretation of facts, and they want to get to the facts themselves and put a statement into a language of their own. The dust of centuries lies thick upon the greater part of our religious phraseology, and the striking fact is, few of those long words so unrelated

to the ordinary man's experience were ever used by Jesus, and these men have found this out. \* \* \* He is tired of ancient creeds and empty phrases, and hungry for the simple statement of religion made by Jesus when he said that it just meant love to God and love to men."

If the above were true and were a proper rule of life then one would be bound to reject all accuracy and thoroughness in every department of knowledge and experience. What would become of the vaunted science of modern life, if only the so-called "practical" is to be the standard? But what he says is happily not true of the leaders in real religious movements. They are men of faith in the old gospel and in theology which explains it. They do accept the theology of sin, of the two natures of Christ, of the Trinity and of regeneration. Otherwise their work comes to naught.

In the same number of *The Constructive Quarterly* are two articles on the effect of the European war on religion. Professor Jean Riviere of France in discussing "The Religious and Catholic Awakening in France" says, "On all sides there is no question of the religious awakening occasioned in our country by the terrible war. Some exaggerate the importance of it, as they had before that excessively darkened the picture of our impiety. In reality there is a strict continuity between the two extremes. The terrible conditions through which we are passing show and develop the religious spirit of France, but they did not give birth to it. A wise psychologist would find the distant germs of it in that idealism and that love of the beautiful, in that instinct of native delicacy and chivalrous loyalty, which are among us racial characteristics and of which the present war has furnished new evidences. The lofty sense of good, the love of all that is noble and just, are they not a homage rendered to God, as they are a gift of His love? Let not any one be astonished if God and the soul resume their place in the heart of the people: 'They are forgotten presences, the consciousness of which is resumed.'"

Dr. Newman Smyth in speaking of "Christianity After the War," declares that "The real test of Christianity is to come after the war. \* \* This present, greatest war of



history shall try as by fire modern Christianity; and whenever peace shall have been made by the sword, shall put it to the test of the greatest opportunity. The critically hopeful question of this present hour for the Church is, After the war shall there be a new epoch of *International Christianity*." To meet this coming day of judgment the American Churches must at once mobilize their forces to make them ready to act as one power. The war has made it plain that nominal Christian civilization is beneath the surface more pagan than we had fondly thought. "All the more imperative and inspiring is the opportunity and the obligation to make international Christianity the prevailing world-power." All the various peace schemes must be tried after all by moral standards. In the last analysis the final security of the world's peace shall be international Christianity. "Greater Church Unity is a necessary condition for that."

The attainment of this unity in the Protestant Church is the problem. Roman Catholicism "has a voice, and it can make it heard even amid the storm of war. The Protestant Church can not." It has no spokesman. Its voice is as the murmurs of the running brooks from distant sources. But this is better than the spiritual absolutism which is a menace against liberty. However it is lamentable that the inefficiency of Protestant Church democracy is the price of their liberty. Yet this inefficiency is not inherent. It should be remedied. The remedy lies in such movements as the so-called "Federal Council of Churches" and a "World Conference on Questions of Faith and Order." "When this World Conference shall be convened, probably in New York, it will not assemble to discuss questions concerning the causes of the war, or to concern itself directly about armaments or Hague conventions. It will meet to consider what the *practice* of Christianity shall require of the Churches of every name throughout the world. High above all enmities and causes of separation, it will raise the flag of Christ's great commandment."

---

In *The American Journal of Theology* (April) Dr.

Henry Preserved Smith of Union Seminary, New York, discusses "Protestant Polemic Against Roman Catholicism": He says that in this irenic age we should be able to consider with calmness the debate which has been going on between Protestants and Roman Catholics for four centuries. One of the difficulties hindering a fair discussion lies, he thinks, in the difference of the point of view. The Catholic historian is wont to describe the Middle Ages as an ideal period in history. The Protestant, on the other hand, regards them as a time of gross ignorance and superstition.

The first attack on the pretensions of the papacy was of a political character because of its claims to supremacy over all earthly monarchs. Happily this aspect of its menace has passed away. The second attack was theological. The theological phases of the conflict pertain to the seat of authority. Luther declared that the Scriptures were the criteria of judgment and Rome clung to tradition.

The third source of dispute lay in the claims of the Catholic Church as the only true and abiding Church of God, because of its unity and perpetuity. Protestants deny this claim on various grounds, which, however, our author thinks have not been made entirely good. The Catholic Church as an institution ordained of God has appealed to many, in spite of temporary lapses in the character of the popes. The point of attack, he thinks, should be shifted. The vulnerable part of Romanism lies in its paganism, in the intrusions from the non-Christian religions. The worship of saints, veneration of relics, flagellation, fasting, exorcism, emphasis of the efficacy of the *opus operatum* are in no sense developments of Christ's teachings.

Then again there are the ethical differences as illustrated in the double standard of living, the monastic and the ordinary life. Yet again the author thinks this form of polemic will have little effect, because of the ascetic tendencies in nearly all religions, as illustrated by certain movements in the Anglican Church. There is further also the Catholic conception of the building up of

character through discipline administered by those in authority, e. g., penance.

A fair attack on Catholicism is directed against its ritualism which confuses human ordinances with divine commands. Thus the eating of meat on certain days is regarded as really sinful as theft or violence, thus blunting the moral senses through lack of proper discrimination between what is human and what is divine.

Another form of polemic is that against the Catholic perversion of the sacraments. And yet, the author thinks that the Catholic conception may make a powerful appeal to those who want "some assurance of salvation, and the realism of the Catholic view seems to offer more solid ground of assurance than the assertions of a preacher, who often evidently gives only his personal view of some passage of Scripture or of some question of the day" instead of the authoritative declaration of the Church.

In addition the adjuncts of Catholic public service is often attractive. "Great Cathedrals, beautiful paintings, artistic music, richly embroidered vestments, and imposing processions have their appeal, though it is not always certain that the impression they make is religious. It is probably true in many cases that the aesthetic emotion is confused with religious experience. The one who enjoys it does not stop to analyze the pleasurable sensation. All that he knows is that for the time being he is lifted out of the ordinary cares that vex his life."

The object of the author is to show that in large part the traditional polemic of Protestantism is ineffectual. The debate will and should go on but it should concentrate itself on these points which are fundamental to religion.

The matter which Professor Smith has in mind is how to prevent Protestants from being deluded into an acceptance of Catholicism. He seems to think that many of the stock arguments against the latter have failed.

It does not seem to us that there is very serious danger of numerous conversions to Catholicism. Indeed "Christian Science" and other peculiarly Protestant fads have drawn away more people from the faith than Catholi-

cism. There always will be sentimentalists and victims of morbid conditions who will find a refuge in the Catholic Church.

The more perplexing problem which confronts us in this country is how to curb the evident effort of the powerful organization to make itself felt in a political way. But we cannot follow the matter here.

---

Professor Theo. Mees, assistant editor of the *Theological Magazine* of the Joint Synod of Ohio, (April), in defining the meaning of "Pulpit Fellowship" allows a certain modification of the rule in its application to fellowship in other matters. "In various other activities, e. g., of an educational nature, mission conferences, to discuss methods and principles (not to *engage in joint mission work in the field*), before an assembly not committed as a body to any distinctive differences, yet holding and confessing the fundamental truths of the Lutheran Church, this perfect consensus, on all points of difference, which true *fellowship* requires, is neither demanded nor is it essential. The points on which the participants differ are not ignored nor evaded, because they do not lie within the sphere of such activities. Hence these cannot be classed as Pulpit Fellowship and do not come under the ban of synodical pronouncement. No violation of principle is involved and therefore, inconsistency cannot be charged."

---

Wm. F. Lofthouse writes of "The Atonement and the Modern Pulpit" in *The Harvard Theological Review* (April). While we disagree with him on the interpretation of the Atonement, the following remarks are pertinent.

"The danger of the older Evangelicalism, as of so much popular Catholicism, was undoubtedly in the emphasis which it laid on the gloomier aspect of its faith. To speak 'as a dying man to dying men' and about the dying Man, was the ideal of the preacher. We have very naturally felt a rebound from that point of view. Our danger lies in the other direction. We are apt to forget both

the immensity of the task of Christ and the horror of disobedience to the will of God. We do not 'whine over our sins.' We hardly think them worth a regret. The reasons for this change of mind have become clear to us, but the consequences may be disastrous. It is just the most eager and reverent minds which have felt the torture of sin most deeply. To forget this is to neglect the most striking facts of human experience, and to relinquish all hope of attaining the heights of spiritual achievements. Yet to attempt to cultivate or induce this sense is useless. It must come of itself or it had better not come at all. And it will come when we pass, in our thinking, from conditions to function when we turn our attention to what we ought to have done, rather than to what we are. Most of us are not good enough to feel this sense of sin. We shall feel it when, like St. Paul, we are consumed with a passion for righteousness and are overwhelmed to think how we have failed. But for such a passion there must be an ideal; and it is such an ideal which is forming itself with increasing clearness in the ethical and practical aspirations of the present age. The change that makes us fear we are losing the power to repent is preparing us, in the providence of God for repentance."

"The Atonement, therefore, is not a doctrine which may be pressed by the theologian but forgotten by the preacher. It is needed in the pulpit as imperatively as ever. The human heart at its best, has suffered alienation from God. There are barriers to be removed. There are stains to be cleansed away. Sin is a fact, and a fact as real and terrible among the respectable and church-going classes as among the outcast and the criminal. But let the preaching of the Atonement take its right place. Let it be content to follow the imperative of conduct—the law that men will be judged according to their works—and the ideals of the new life of communion with God and of the new heaven and the new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness. When this is done, the modern mind, now led by its qualities to think that the atonement is unneces-

sary, will be forced by its defects to find in the Atonement the one thing needful."

In *The International Review of Missions* (April) in an article by Dr. Harlan Beach on "The Negro Christian Student Conference," occurs the following paragraph on the evangelization of Africa, the last sentence of which sums up a wide experience.

"But the question arises as to whether the American negroes are as yet fitted for this difficult task. The commission's answer was a frank one and was based upon data from all the American societies which had employed colored missionaries in Africa. Of nineteen boards of white churches laboring there to-day, five employ twenty-three negroes who are in a true sense missionaries from the United States. Other societies had commissioned Negroes, but at present they have none in their service. Four missionary boards, managed solely by colored churches here, have sent out and now employ in Africa somewhat less than one hundred and fifty colored men and women. In cases in which they were strong and well prepared missionaries, they proved effective, though African prejudices and the estimate in which white men, powerful in the continent, held them, militated against their highest usefulness. The great obstacle to their success is found in the inferior preparation of many of them. Thus one colored board stated that in eighteen years it had not succeeded in securing a single college-trained man, while another reported that it required of its candidates 'training to the extent of a full grammar course and the Holy Bible.' Experiments had been tried by the white boards with the apparent result that unprofitable comparisons and slight inter-racial friction in the mission itself were minimized when an entire station—in one case an entire mission—was given into the hands of the Negro members of their staff, instead of having the two races labor side by side on an equal basis. In general the data show that there is no great economy in the use of the American Negro as a missionary by

white boards and that there is great wastefulness in employing Negroes of small ability."

Principal Forsythe in *The London Quarterly Review* (April) speaks in the following trenchant way of the need of thorough preparation for the ministry:

"The power in the pulpit always has its source outside the pulpit—a statement which I reinforce with the remark that the preacher will not be a failure, whether he be an idol or not, who thinks as much as he speaks, and prays as much as he preaches.

"But such reflections will tempt some to say that the true object of ministerial training is to make preachers and pastors, and that for this purpose a good deal of instruction could be spared if only piety and sympathy were cherished as they should be. And no doubt, knowledge or even thought is too dearly bought at the cost of these. But men from certain sections of the mission field for instance, who started and went so far equipped with but the pious passion for souls, come and ask me for some guidance in their belated study, telling me they are no longer competent to guide the churches they gathered, and that their fields threaten to revert to prairies again. The fact is that even if a man equipped with due attainments gather a church, to prevent labefaction it must grow in grace and the intelligent knowledge of Christ, and of what Christ is for the moral soul of God and man. And especially it must grow in that knowledge of him which is relevant not simply to personal and domestic needs but to the intelligent *milieu* in which the members of the Church find themselves even in every local paper and every public meeting. If the pastor and teacher have no power to handle such things, and no ability to do more than show that he buys the minor books, reads the little paper and knows the little mind, the influence of poetry alone will not do the work of Christian faith. His sympathy, losing in intelligence, will lose in value as time goes on. And a veil will gradually fall between him and his people, which a devout dogmatism can neither lift nor rend. He will cease to be the preacher he was, because



he was never equipped to be more than an impressionist, because at the most he only learned to be a reader and to know the questions. He never learned to be a student and to master the answers. He has not learned to go deeper than those who ask the questions, because reading was part of the luxury of life and no part of its toil; because his thought but occurred to him and was not dug from a mine; because his truth cost him nothing but a little mental exposure, like a sensitive plate in an easy chair to the printed ray; because it therefore was not dear as the things are dear that cost much to master, and powerful, as the things are that by our wrestling prevail; because he had learned the habit of valuing truth but for its effect, of pursuing but its impressionist side; because he had not learned to love and worship it for beating himself small; and because, therefore, in the true spirit of a sect, if only he could move an audience, he had less concern for what could win the age. He had but the tangential mind; he centralized, he bottomed, nothing. The result is that in due course he wears out; and he becomes a burden to the Church because he had no touch either with the great world facing it, or the last reality founding it. He did not even know his Bible, because he knew nothing else. This is not a plea for scholarship, but for the culture of that blended mind, heart, and conscience which is the keynote of apostolic faith, and which will not let us alone till it has fired our clay at the burning foundations of the moral world in the Cross of Christ with its revolution and regeneration of all natural things."

II. IN GERMAN. BY PROFESSOR ABDEL ROSS WENTZ, PH.D.

The religious press of Germany is busy discussing the great war in its bearings upon religion and the Church. Scarcely an issue that does not contain several articles on some aspects of this absorbing question. Some of them are abstract discussions of principles. Others contain very practical proposals. Everybody seems to realize that the times are fraught with tremendous possibilities. Changes are sure to come in the relation of the Church to the State and in her relation to the masses.

Wise heads and skilful hands are devoting themselves to the work of preparing for the reconstruction.

The discussions in the current religious and theological press serve to reflect not only the probable lines along which the reconstruction will proceed but also the general condition of affairs in the German Church at the outbreak of the war and the changes that have been brought about by the war. We present herewith a translation of one of these articles. It is the report of an address delivered by Professor Ihmels of Leipzig, President of the General Lutheran Conference. The Executive Committee of the Conference met at Magdeburg on April 12th and 13th to discuss the situation in the Church and to consider what special duties arise from the circumstances. Professor Ihmels had informed himself in advance by means of a questionnaire among the members of the Conference, and this information he made the basis of his address. We present only the brief report of the address which appeared in the *Allgemeine Evangelisch-Lutherische Kirchenzeitung* of April 23rd. It is full of informing allusions, both to the present and to the past, and it indicates what the attitude of the General Conference is towards the questions involved. The article follows.

#### THE SITUATION.

Our nation has reached one of the decisive points of its history. We are confronting a sort of crisis. In various quarters men have spoken of a national regeneration, but it is still too early for that. Nevertheless, it must be admitted that the present situation means that God is asking our nation whether it will go with Him or without Him. And for us who are interested in the work of the Church the question naturally arises, What can we do to turn this crisis to profit for the people? In other words, Shall we be able to hold fast to the Church as a natural Church embracing the whole people.

How are we to view the present situation? Great things have taken place among our people. We have

witnessed a spirit of sacrifice that is sublime beyond compare. Old and young have streamed to the colors and have vied with one another in offering their services and their lives. Before this crisis arose the youth of the land had seemed to be engrossed in soft living and purely selfish ambitions. But with one stroke this is all changed. And there can be no doubt that the effects of this re-awakening will be felt even after this crisis has passed.

True, the spirit of sacrifice does not seem to have pervaded all classes to the same extent. Some deplorable things have taken place at home. Some of the women from among the working classes have given themselves over to pleasure even more than in times of peace. Of course this must not be taken too seriously, because, in the first place, it is always easier to make great sacrifices than to make small ones of daily routine. In the second place, the smaller sacrifices require a previous training and practice, and as a matter of fact our educated classes have shown themselves more willing to make the necessary sacrifices than the uneducated. In the third place, the smaller sacrifices of daily life require a complete change of view-point which the individual does not accomplish over night.

Far more serious and depressing are the observations that are made in the sphere of morality in its more narrow sense. If the wide-spread spirit of sacrifice has been a happy surprise, the growth of immorality has been a most unhappy disappointment. One would not have thought that these sins would persist thus in times of war. But if the reports are at all true the situation is truly astounding. And unfortunately there has as yet been very little reaction against it. There have indeed been public protests, petitions, appeals, and mass-meetings, but the general public has not been touched. Most people do not seem to recognize that we have to do in this matter with a sin against God. It simply shows how far removed the people as a whole are from an intimate touch with the will of God.

Or are we perhaps able to say that this touch is still present even where it does not appear? Is there a Chris-

tianity outside the walls of the churches? Or is it perhaps stronger outside than inside the Church? Certainly the question of religion has been brought into striking prominence by the war. That is indicated in various ways. Even the daily press shows a deeper interest in Christianity and provides space for Christian discussions. The only question is whether this religious movement really springs from a religious impulse or whether it is a purely patriotic demonstration. The spirit of penitence has been totally absent from the general temper of the public. But we must not be too hasty in our judgments. There are evidences that the people are willing to listen to words of exhortation to penitence. Let us learn the proper way of presenting the matter and the press will make room for our words.

Now what is the situation in the Church? An increase in church attendance has been noted everywhere. But who are the church-goers? If we examine the matter with special reference to the various classes of people we find that the men especially are finding their way to church again. But there is a difference in different classes. We naturally ask more specifically, How about the educated? How about the laboring classes? Doubtless many of the educated people of the nation have resumed their church-going. But with this very class it would perhaps be risky to assume a sudden change of front in this respect. He who has consciously formed for himself a fixed view of the world will not easily reverse his point of view in later years. This applies especially to the older generation. With the educated youth it is different. Already before the war religious societies had made their way into the gymnasias. Missionary societies and Bible study classes were springing up, such as one would not have dreamed of a generation ago. Moreover, among the students of the universities things were changing. It was really inspiring to see the student Young Men's Christian Association gathering its membership from all departments of the universities and bringing them under the banner of Christianity. Then, too, there were the old student fraternities with Chris-

tian principles, and the Bible discussions of recent origin. It is clear that a new interest in Christianity is making itself felt among the educated youth of the land. In short, in the educated youth we may plant our hopes for the future of our religion. On the other hand, the youth of the laboring classes give cause for grave concern. Their early independence works unfavorably upon them, and it is just from the ranks of the working classes that the complaints come about the unfavorable influence of the war upon the youth.

So far as the laborers in general are concerned, it may be said that on the whole they come to church in larger numbers now than formerly, even the organized laborers. Their confidence in the Church has been increased. The pastoral office has been able to do much unselfish service not only for those who are at the front but also for those who have remained at home, and this is being recognized. But it is a question whether the leaders of organized labor will permit their followers to stick to the Church after the war has closed. And will they have the strength to insist upon their right to religion? Perhaps if it is possible really to awaken the laborers as individuals it will be possible also to break the power of their leaders. At any rate the Church must avoid even the appearance of being capitalistic, and to this end she must not allow herself to be placed in the position of a mere paid hand-maid of the State.

If it be asked how deep the new religious life has gone, the answer must be that it is not yet possible to say. In the Churches where the question of personal salvation was a live one before the war began, the effect of the war has been to increase and deepen the religious life. Where that question was not a live one, the effect has been smaller. But nowhere have the last few months passed without leaving some kind of trace behind. Of course it was a mistake to speak already of a regeneration of the entire people. Nevertheless, one thing is certain, namely, that we are living in a time of a real divine call. So much the more intensive must be our work of sowing the seed

among the people, and then it is God alone who can give the increase.

#### OUR DUTY.

The duration of the war is the time to sow the seed. And what is the seed that we are to sow? First and foremost of all we are to use God's Word. If only God's Word be given free course in the churches! If this opportunity is to be used to advantage, you as an individual must make use of God's Word. You as the head of a family must use it in your home. You as a pastor must use it in your pulpit. Patriotic addresses will not help the congregation. People who come to church want to hear God's Word. It is really alarming to see what patriotic effusions are sometimes poured forth these days in the churches. No, God's Word alone is the remedy. And it should be preached in both of its aspects, both as Law and as Gospel. We must use the Gospel to invite men but we must not omit to use the Law, the witness of a living God who is to be feared. This has been neglected. Perhaps the Church is partly to blame for the indifference towards the sixth commandment. God must be preached from the pulpit, the God who is holy and makes demands from his creatures. The Gospel also must be preached, not a part of it but the whole. It is wicked to pass over the core of the Gospel in silence as is so often done. Sometimes we hear "special" sermons in which the great divine facts are not even mentioned. Surely the preacher should never tire of leading his congregation to the cross.

Of course this must not be done mechanically. For we know very well that it is a new era into which we are spreading the old Gospel, and this requires adaptation. Moreover, the preacher in the big city will speak in a different way from that in which the preacher in the country will speak. Nevertheless, it must be God's Word, unabridged and unaltered. This is the chief thing for our age as well as for every other age. And what is our purpose in using it thus assiduously? To lead men

to faith. Our congregations are not ideal congregations of the faithful. They consist to a large extent of persons who are seeking, of persons who stand at a distance, and we must lead them back to God. We must seek to arouse their faith, to keep them in the faith, and to perfect their faith. Thus all will be served according to their needs, those who lag behind in matters of faith as well as those who are farther advanced.

It stands to reason that if God's Word is to accomplish its purpose it must be made to reach the people. And it is a very difficult matter to really reach the individuals in the giant congregations of the large cities. But three ways lie open to our view. First, the large parishes must be divided and sub-divided and the number of the ministers and churches must be increased. Think, for example, of Copenhagen, where in a short time the city has been covered with a net-work of churches. The churches need not always be cathedrals; plain houses of prayer will suffice. And even if it cannot be accomplished in a single day we can at least begin to-day. Second, the organizations which we have had hitherto must now be broadened out. Perhaps we shall now have a scarcity of pastors and so we shall be driven to make larger use of the laymen in the service of the Church, and they will be better able to reach the individuals among our constituency. Third, personal work and pastoral oversight must be prosecuted more intensively than hitherto. It must never again occur that the visiting of the sick in a congregation should occasion surprise as something exceptional. The average pastor has little idea how even the educated long for pastoral ministration. We may rest assured that we do not labor in vain when we practice with diligence our personal work with individual souls. The first visit may not effect very much, but it brings about a personal touch which may later prove to be very valuable.

Very important also is the question of religious instruction of the children in the schools. This is a sore point. On paper everything looks well, but the facts in the case tell a different story. And the most painful feature of the whole matter is that it is such an intangible thing. It



glides through our fingers with such ease that we may well question whether the injury can be repaired at all any more. But we dare not lose courage. The future of our people demands that our youth be trained in the confession of the Church.

I say the future of our people demands it. For we want our Church to remain a Church of the people, a national Church. Our people, the whole people, constitute the field to which the Lord of the Church has sent us. We must put forth every effort to gain the confidence of the people as a whole. For it goes without saying that the pastor dare not identify himself with any party or favor any party, because he belongs to the entire congregation. He must avoid even the appearance of being a reactionary, and the Church must avoid the appearance of being a trainbearer for the State. She must have the courage to preach God's Word to those who are below as well as to those who are above. She must make the Word of God to shed its sacred light upon all human relationships. She must abolish all customs that are unsocial, like those that prevent the laborer from getting a good place in the house of God, or those that offend the poorer classes, as so often occurs, for example, at burials. The workingman should be made to feel that in the Church the inequality of the classes ceases, because the Church is the servant of God. On the other hand, the intelligent and educated classes should be made to feel that in the pastor they have one who is able to give answer to the burning questions of the day, one who can present the Gospel as a real power in the spiritual world of the present.

Our task seems specially difficult in view of the great national movement that is in full swing just now. Glorious as this movement has been and joyfully as we have greeted it, we must not close our eyes to the peculiar dangers that it brings with it. For example, some enthusiasts for things German are beginning to dream and to talk of one single national German Church. Of course there are insurmountable difficulties in the way of such a project. But it is a question whether the idealists will listen to dispassionate considerations. If not, then they

will simply work further confusion in the Protestant Church. At any rate, we should let it be known most emphatically that we are strictly opposed to such a scheme. On the other hand, the nationalistic idea can be of great value to us, and we should cultivate it, not only in times of war but at all times. We should welcome everything that can strengthen the national movement. We should avoid narrowness in this matter. For instance it would be very easy to object to the government training of the youth, on the ground that it might perhaps lead them to neglect the Church on Sundays. But what could we gain by such objections? No, let us join in these things and then we shall have some say in the national movement and we shall be able to keep it in touch with the Church.

That brings us to the last and most important question, namely, whether it will be possible to preserve the established Church, the Church that embraces the whole people. Let us look the matter squarely in the face. We may distinguish between the established Church as an organization and those individuals within the organization who believe and accept the confessions of the Church. The organized Church without the confession may be a financial organization, but it is no longer a Church. The whole problem, therefore, is to extend the confessing Church until it is identical with the organized Church. If this is to be done, the confessing Church must be broad enough to include the whole people.

One great difficulty has always confronted our Church, namely, that the Church in its ideal and in its very essence is the communion of believers, but this ideal has never been realized. What is the result? Two things. On the one hand, some demand separation from unbelievers so that the communion of the believers may remain pure. This is the idea of the sects. On the other hand, some treat the existing Church as the actual congregation of believers, in spite of all evidence to the contrary. Everything is cut to that formula. The service of worship, the liturgy, and so forth, all contain forms which imply that they are dealing only with believers. Now if

we take our stand upon the facts and if we wish to preserve the Church as a national Church, a Church of the whole people, we dare not fail to recognize that principle that the Church must provide room for all who will accept her services from the standpoint of the confession. Those who will not thus accept her services can of course find no room in her. But for the others room *must* be provided. If this is to be done we must reckon in our services with the fact that the greater part of the congregation consists of persons who merely conform but do not actually believe. If this fact is kept in mind the existing orders and formulas of the Church will call for some revision. This is a very delicate matter. It must come as a further development of what we now have and it should be undertaken only with the very greatest care.

At any rate one thing is certain: we want to preserve a Church that will embrace the whole people, though of course we do not advocate a State-Church. We do not mean to insist upon cutting the bonds that connect us with the State. Not at all. That would be a complete misinterpretation of the occasion that has brought about the revival of religion among our people. We should not force the Church to become a Free Church and thus expose her to all the limitations and embarrassments that would then be hers. Think, for example, of the difficulties that would then attend the religious instruction of the youth, or think of the financial straits. Nevertheless, we should lose no time in trying to place the individual congregations in a position of financial independence. Our aim must always be to make the Church embrace the people as a whole and at the same time to make her a Church of the confession.

But the greater the difficulties that confront us in these serious times, the more satisfying it is to realize that in the last analysis and under all circumstances only one thing is necessary, namely, to preach the Word of God, and that too in a form adapted to our times and with that weapon to press out among the public and overthrow the hindrances. God has given us these times as an oc-

casion to reach the masses. May He show us the proper ways and vouchsafe to us His Spirit that we may follow His will.

*Gettysburg, Pa.*

## ARTICLE X.

## REVIEW OF RECENT LITERATURE.

HODDER AND STAUGHTON, LONDON: NEW YORK, GEORGE H. DORAN COMPANY.

*A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research.* By A. T. Robertson, M.A., D.D., LL.D., Professor of Interpretation of the New Testament in the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Ky. Price \$5.00 net.

This remarkable work of almost 1400 pages is the product of twelve years of painstaking pursuit and solicitous care on the part of the author. It is a complete grammar, complete not in the sense that it is without defects recognized by the author, but that it covers all parts of a grammarian's subject.

Some of the territory of the commentator has been annexed to the work, and the index of texts is probably more extensive than necessary to embrace the most important and disputed texts, which features if abridged would have lessened the number of pages without serious detriment to the work. But this fulness of detail makes the grammar serviceable to the weaker as well as to the stronger and more experienced textual student.

Dr. Robertson pursues the historical method and furnishes a philological biography of the disputed and difficult words, as well as an elucidation of the grammatical structure and relation of words. Comparative philology, and examples of modern Greek are brought to bear on word structure and meaning. The interpretative comments, while adding to the bulk of the volume, relieve it of a dry as dust character, which almost invariably attends grammatical science.

The mass of material which historical study has accumulated since the days of Winer has long left his work in the background, and the historical method of research has made it inadvisable simply to revise and enlarge his work. Fifteen years ago Schmiedel left off his revision of Winer in the middle of a sentence; Professor Moulton has as yet issued but the first volume as a prolegomena to the study of New Testament Greek; and while Dr. Blass has produced a finished work, Dr. Robertson in following

the historical method has pursued the lines rather of Jan-naris and has given as a completer work.

The author says, "The present volume is designed for advanced students in theological schools, for the use of teachers, for scholarly pastors who wish a comprehensive grammar of the Greek New Testament on the desk for constant use, for all who make a thorough study of the New Testament or who are interested in the study of language, and for libraries."

The work is divided into three parts: Introduction, Accidence, and Syntax.

It is now established that the New Testament Greek is the common Greek in colloquial use in the first Christian century as is evidenced by numerous papyri of that era. Dr. Robertson has given rather more space for the vindication of the fact than is needful, but his careful method clinches the proofs by historical detail.

Repetition occurs, but it is the repetition of the ardent teacher who wishes to round out every feature in full detail.

The long and difficult researches of Dr. Robertson have provided us with an up-to-date grammar. It is a great work, monumental and scholarly, and only the student of New Testament Greek can appreciate the toil and care necessary to produce such a science of New Testament grammar. The references and quotations are most accurate, and the printing of both Greek and English type shows the best practical art of the publisher.

M. COOVER.

#### THE METHODIST BOOK CONCERN. NEW YORK.

*The Quest for Wonder, and Other Philosophical and Theological Studies.* By Lynn Harold Hough, Professor of Historical Theology in Garrett Biblical Institute. Cloth, 8 mo. Pp. 302. Price net \$1.00.

These are popular essays which young ministers may read with profit. In the chapter on "The New Orthodoxy" the author holds that a mere mechanical view of the Bible and of religious authority based upon it can not be held, nevertheless the new orthodoxy differs in no essential way from the old.

The Atonement is discussed from the various points of view giving preference to the theory of Dr. O. A. Curtis, as it appears in his book, "The Christian Faith," called the "Racial Theory of our Lord's Redemptive Work." This is after all only an explication of the Satisfaction Theory, which to us seems to be most probably true.

The author's estimate of Ritschl appears to be correct and gives undoubted evidence of the author's conservative position. Ritschl allows no Trinity, no pre-existent Christ, no real atonement.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

THE ABINGDON PRESS. NEW YORK.

*The Heart of Blackstone* or Principles of the Common Law. By Nanette B. Paul, LL.B., Lecturer on Law in Washington College, Washington, D. C. Introduction by Hon. Thomas H. Anderson, Justice of the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia. Cloth, 8 mo. Pp. 247. Price \$1.00 net.

Blackstone, the most eminent jurist of England in the eighteenth century, has put the world under obligations by his interpretation of the English constitution and the affirmation of great fundamental principles. Every lawyer must know Blackstone. Miss Paul has rendered the public a great service in interpreting Blackstone and common law in every-day language. Every citizen of the United States should know the law as Miss Paul expounds it, and every minister ought to have a comprehension of the great underlying truths of law. No one to our knowledge has placed within the reach of all these great matters as well as Miss Paul has done. We have no hesitation in saying that "The Heart of Blackstone" ought to be made a text-book in the higher grades of our public schools.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

THE MACMILLAN CO. NEW YORK.

*The Rise of Modern Religious Ideas.* By Arthur Cushman McGiffert. Cloth, 8 mo. Pp. 310. Price \$1.50 net.

Dr. McGiffert of Union Seminary, N. Y., writes from the standpoint of those who believe that they have been emancipated from the shackles of the old theology and have found a more excellent way in a reconstructed theology. The present volume is based upon the Earl Lectures given before the Pacific Theological Seminary at Berkeley, California, in September, 1912. It is divided into two parts, the first treating briefly of Disintegration, beginning with the Pietism of Spener and reaching its



climax in the Critical Philosophy of Descartes Spinoza, Leibnitz, Wolf, and Kant.

The second part treats of Reconstruction beginning with Kant and his successors and concluding with the supposed true seat of Religious Authority which "modern theology" affirms.

While there is nothing essentially new in this volume the matter is presented in a fresh and interesting manner. We confess to some weariness in going over the old grounds of philosophy often more false than true. To Dr. McGiffert evolution is the magic word that unlocks the mystery of the world, while he is, of course, a theist believing that God "created the germs from which all existing forms of life" eventually came. The Bible is now looked upon no longer as a revelation from God but as a product of natural evolution. "Scholars now trace the development of the religious ideas contained in it and show the circumstances under which they have arisen and the influences by which they have been determined." According to this the Bible is no more inspired than any other history. It is still a good book, but must be taken with "a grain of salt."

"The deity of Christ," according to our author, "resides in the completeness of his consciousness with God." Now surely this is a vague and meaningless assertion. The eternal Son, as a real Person, must necessarily eternally have realized himself. Self-consciousness is an inherent element of a rational being. To speak of deity being dependent upon an act or state is to speak incoherently, or else to deny its essential nature.

The kind of deity which our author finds in Christ is the deity which the Unitarian receives. "In a true sense all men are divine. \* \* \* Essentially Christ is no more divine than we are or than nature is." There is truth in this, but it is truth distorted. We are not divine as Christ is. He is eternal God, we are His creatures. We are not Deity; Christ is. We would insist just as earnestly as Dr. McGiffert that man was created in God's image and that he is not so alien now that he cannot be restored. But this is a vastly different matter from confounding God and man.

Much is made in the writings of the modern school of theology of the change in the view of the universe and of God's relation to it. It is held that the "divine immanence" was entirely misunderstood. It is held that "modern science" has revolutionized theology and that practically nothing is left of it in advanced up-to-date schools. Luther and his contemporaries are cited for their crude

world-views. In reply to this we would say that if Luther was wrong in his conception of the universe, it was not the fault of his theology but of the false science of his day. Moreover the faulty scientific views of Luther and others do not in the least affect the heart of their theology.

The alleged untenableness of the old theology, at least as far as the Lutheran Church is concerned, is not apparent. The great Lutheran Church of America, including every one of its theological seminaries, receives and holds the ecumenical creeds and the Augsburg Confession. If we may judge the doctrinal attitude of millions of people from great religious movements, however regrettable the latter may be in their extravagance, we must conclude that the old faith is still the faith of the people.

Dr. McGiffert naturally insists on the modern view of the seat of authority in religion. Of course it can no longer be the point in the papacy. As "modern theology" rejects the inspiration of the Bible, it can not recognize its authority as absolute. Even Christ must be constantly subjected to new tests, as our knowledge and apprehension widens. If there be any authority left it must be found in oneself, of course at its best.

It is not surprising that the Presbyterian Church repudiates the teachings of Union Seminary. We predict that history will class much of these teachings with the exploded heresies of other days, and that the Church will go on and conquer in the path of the "traditional" faith.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

THE GERMAN LITERARY BOARD. BURLINGTON, IOWA.

*Selected Sermons and Addresses.* By the Rev. S. A. Ort, D.D., LL.D., with Portrait. Cloth, 6 x 9. Pp. 310. Price \$1.50 net.

This is a memorial volume made up principally of brief sermons and sayings selected by the Rev. H. C. Stafford from the manuscripts of the late, lamented Dr. Samuel Alfred Ort, mathematician, philosopher, theologian and preacher. Dr. Keyser and Dr. Bauslin contribute a Foreword and an Introduction respectively, paying each a high tribute to the character and to the genius of Dr. Ort.

I had the pleasure of an acquaintance with Dr. Ort, and was always impressed with the evident strength of the man. He was powerful in debate and excelled as a

preacher. He possessed the elements of a good presence, a clear ringing voice, a ready command of language and a devout spirit. He was kind and approachable, and attracted to himself many friends.

Dr. Ort was not given to theological vagaries, which often are a temptation to philosophic minds. He was thoroughly evangelical in his views, as is apparent from this volume. He became more and more a thorough Lutheran, believing with all his heart in the Christo-centric teachings of our dogmatic writings.

Turning to the sermons and addresses, we are struck at once by their simplicity and directness. They are very readable and edifying, though they were not written for the eye but for the ear. We, who knew him, recall the ardor and the eloquence of the living speaker, as we read his words.

Dr. Ort's life and labors deserve this memorial volume, which we trust will have a wide circulation.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

*A Boy's Religion.* By Edwin Holt Hughes, one of the Bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church. Cloth, 12 mo. Pp. 119. Price 50 cents net.

This little volume, without any pretensions to learning, is full of tenderness for the boy and earnest solicitude for his salvation. He knows the boy, for he remembers that he was once a boy. Out of the fulness of a rich experience, he tells us what a real boy is and how he may be won. He lays no great stress upon revival methods but much upon training. We could wish that the noble bishop might study the Lutheran way of Christian nurture and training. It would confirm him and help him to make future editions of his little book even better than this one. In the emphasis which he lays upon the home and upon the influence of pastor and teacher he shows that he has written from experience and observation.

We heartily commend the book to all lovers of boys.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

